DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 027 361 24 UD 007 871

By-Offenbacher, Deborah I.

Cultures in Conflict: Home and School as Seen Through the Eyes of Lower Class Students. Final Report.

New School for Social Research, New York, N.Y.

Spons Agency-Office of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C.

Bureau No-BR-6-8941

Pub Date Jan 69

Contract-OEC-1-7-008941-2043

Note-110p.

EDRS Price MF-$0.50 HC-$5.60

Descriptors-Academic Achievement, Aspiration, *Culture Conflict, *Educational Attitudes, *Family Life, Family Relationship, *Interpersonal Competence, Interviews, *Lower Class Students, Middle Class Culture, Parent Attitudes, Self Concept, Student Attitudes

Identifiers-Baltimore, New York City

This study investigated whether the lower class student preceives a "conflict of subcultures" between his home environment and his middle class oriented school. Data were collected through interviews with 12- to 16-year-old lower class students in New York City and Baltimore. The 110 students on whom the findings are based were divided into four groups by social class and type of school attended. Interviews covered students' aspirations, attitudes, perception of parental expectations, and interpersonal competence. Data revealed that lower class students do not find the norms and attitudes of their homes and their schools in conflict. It was found, however, that the academically unsuccessful lower class group was less socially competent than the others. This variable did not correlate with socioeconomic status; data suggested that it may be a psychological variable dialectically but not deterministically related to social class. (EF)

BR 6-8941
PA-24
OE-BR

ED027361 UD

FINAL REPORT
Contract No. OEG-1-7-008941-2043

CULTURES IN CONFLICT

Home and School as Seen Through the Eyes of Lower Class Students

January 1969

U. S. DEPARTMENT OF
HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

Office of Education
Bureau of Research

UD 007871

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

CULTURES IN CONFLICT

Home and School as Seen Through the Eyes of Lower Class Students

Contract No. OEG-1-7-008941-2043

Deborah I. Offenbacher

January 1969

The research reported herein was performed pursuant to a contract with the Office of Education, U. S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Contractors undertaking such projects under Government sponsorship are encouraged to express freely their professional judgment in the conduct of the project. Points of view or opinions stated do not, therefore, necessarily represent official Office of Education position or policy.

Graduate Faculty of Political and Social Science
New School for Social Research

New York, New York

UD 007 871

CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION

Page

Acknowledgements

Original Objective:
The 'Conflict of Subcultures' Hypothesis. 1

Further Objectives Arising from the Nature of the Data:
A Comparison of Four Subcultures. 3

METHOD AND SAMPLE

Method of Study 5

Subjects. 6
Bayview--Market Street--Prospect Hill--High Towers

Academic Performance. 12
Grade Level Relative to Age--Truancy--Homework--
Liking School--College Plans

Demographic and Related Variables 14
Ethnicity--Sex--Family Status--Family Size--
Age of Respondents as Compared with Siblings--
Occupation of Parents--Education of Parents--
Neighborhood

RESULTS

The Purpose of Education as Perceived by the Student. 21

Students' Aspirations 26
Educational Plans--Occupational Plans--
Three Wishes Test

Page

Students' Attitudes Toward School 34
What Respondents Like About School--What Respondents Dislike About School--Subjects Liked--If They Could Change the School--Does Liking a Teacher Make a Difference in How Well One Works?--What Respondents Like About Their Teachers--What Respondents Dislike About Their Teachers--Teachers' Expectations as Seen by Students

Parents' Attitude Toward Education. 56
Who Helps with Homework--Parents Visiting School--What Parents Say About Education--Parental Vs. Teachers' Expectations--Why Parents Nag

Family Relationships. 61
Respondents' Relations with Family--What Respondents Like About Their Parents--What Respondents Dislike About Their Parents--What Respondents and Family Do Together--Frequency of Joint Activity

Other Interpersonal Relationships 69
What Respondents Like About People--What Respondents Dislike About People--What Respondents Like About Friends--What Respondents Dislike About Friends--Leisure Time Activities Shared with Friends--Church Attendance--Role Models--Interviewers' Ratings of Family and General Interpersonal Relationships--Per Cent of 'Dislike' Responses in Interpersonal Relations

Self-Image. 79
Positive and Negative Descriptions of Self--Self-Image--Interviewers' Ratings of Subjects' Characteristics--Interviewers' Rating of Perception of Social Norms

DISCUSSION

The Conflict of Subcultures and the Student 83

'Social Competence': Differences Between Subcultures in this Study 88

IMPLICATIONS. 92

SUMMARY 97

APPENDIX. 101

REFERENCES. 103

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

To safeguard the anonymity of the respondents, we cannot identify the schools which permitted us to record the interviews on which this report is based. We would like, however, to acknowledge the generous cooperation of Gloria Hall, William Harris, David Hernandez, William Jesinkey, Georgette Kohlrieser and Rodman Pellett. The assistance of Anne R. Offenbacher of the Bureau of Child Guidance (New York Board of Education) in the interpretation of some of our data is also gratefully acknowledged. Last but not least, the writer's thanks go to her assistant, Susan Prager, and to the following graduate students at the New School for Social Research: Ruth Bachrach, Patricia Bonfield, Frieda Greer, Robert Podhurst and Constance Poster.

INTRODUCTION

Original Objective: The 'Conflict of Subcultures' Hypothesis

The original objective of this study is indicated in the following excerpts from our project proposal.

"The prospectus for the Cultures of Schools Program (under which this study was funded) contains two propositions which may serve as a starting point for the pilot study outlined in the following:

1. The typical American student is fated to learn many of his attitudes from his parents.
2. In contemporary urban society the general process of socialization is increasingly a function of the educational establishment.

"In other words, most American students are exposed to two patterns of socialization: those prevailing in their homes and neighborhoods and those prevalent in our public elementary and high schools. For some students, these two sets of attitudes, norms and role models may be fully consonant and mutually reinforcing. For others, they may represent two disjunctive and at times contradictory subcultures.

"In a different context, Waller (1) has observed that 'culture conflicts' often arise from differences in the normative system of students and educators. Recent studies of economical and cultural deprivation point to similar discrepancies between the values, cognitive styles, and role prescriptions found in many lower class homes and those of an educational system traditionally geared to middle class life styles and aspirations.(2, 3) In a paper titled The Disadvantaged Child and the Learning Process, (4) Martin P. Deutsch notes:

> We know that children from underprivileged environments tend to come to school with a qualitatively different preparation for the demands of both the learning process and the behavioral equipments of the classroom. There are various differences in the kinds of socializing experiences these children have had, as contrasted with the middle class child. The culture of their environment is a different one from the culture that has molded the school and its educational techniques and theories.

"Some authors tend to blame the poor scholastic achievements of many lower class students primarily on the educational system, especially the middle class biases of the teachers.(5) Others argue that such accusations are but gross oversimplifications and that the societal milieu rather than the school ought to be held responsible for poor performance and high dropout rates among students from low income families.(6) In either case, one can hardly deny the salience of the following comments by Deutsch:(7)

> We know that it is difficult for all peoples to span cultural discontinuities, and yet we make little effort to prepare administrative personnel or teachers and guidance staff to assist the child in this transition from one cultural context to another. This transition must have serious psychological consequences for the child, and probably plays a major role in influencing his later perceptions of other social institutions as he is introduced to them.

"The impact of social class on academic achievement, levels of aspirations, dropout rates, etc., have been investigated in a number of empirical studies.(8) However, since most of these studies involve correlations between sets of objective criteria, we gain little insight into the subjective experience of the student involved. In a sense, we are faced with a kind of 'black box' explanation in which a combination of low socioeconomic status and public education are fed in at one end and are shown to emerge as poor scholastic attainment of the other. Of what goes on in the mind of the agent of this transformation, i.e., the student himself, we learn very little. Nor do we learn why in some instances the same 'input' does not produce the same 'output.' As Gross notes:(9)

> Although the hypothesis that the child's social class placement or socioeconomic status is related to his educational behavior is generally supported, each of these studies reveals that there is considerable variability in the behavior of children in the same social class. The examination of such factors as peer group influence, parental level of aspirations for the child, and role models may shed light on the differential behavior of children in the same social stratum.

"The pilot project proposed here is designed to study the experiences of economically and culturally deprived students as they come to terms with the norms, expectations and role prescriptions of the public school system. What we shall attempt to explore is the students own 'definition of the situation' in terms of questions such as:

1. To what extent does the student himself experience a sense of discrepancy of conflict between the norms, values, expectations and role models which confront him at home as compared to those of the school?

2. If the student is aware of such discrepancies does he handle them
   - --by continuing to identify with the home?
   - --by identifying with the subculture of the school and rejecting the subculture of the home?
   - --by a compromise in which he orients himself to selected features in either subculture?
   - --by defensive mechanisms such as apathy or withdrawal from areas of conflict?

3. What conditions in the environment of home or school tend to foster identification and/or compliance with either subculture? What conditions tend to foster rejection of either subculture?

Further Objectives Arising from the Nature of the Data: A Comparison of Four Subcultures

As indicated in our interim report(10) our research did not reveal any awareness of a 'conflict of subcultures' on the part of our respondents. Hence, the second part of the proposed program--the attempt to explore how the student deals with such a conflict--could not be carried out. On the other hand, the nature of the data led our analysis in a direction not envisaged in the original proposal. Before presenting our methods and findings, a word must be said about the way in which this departure affects the scope of the report submitted in the following.

At the time this research was undertaken, a great many studies dealing with 'lower class culture' in general, and the nature of the urban slum school in particular, were already in progress. Findings of these investigations, which were beginning to receive wide publicity, were not always complimentary to their subjects. As a result, our own efforts to find access to subjects through official channels--such as formal requests to schools or community agencies--met with a good deal of resistance and suspicion. To overcome this obstacle, the writer and the graduate students participating in the study used personal contacts with a number of schools, institutions, and individuals. This approach yielded not only a much more varigated sample than had been originally anticipated, but also a total of almost two hundred interviews --twice the number projected in the original proposal.

This embarrassment of riches led, even at a first, cursory review of tapes, to the realization that we were dealing not with one, but with a number of subcultures--partly because of differences in background of respondents, and partly because of differences in the 'goal orientation' of the schools they attended. It also became obvious that while there was no difference between these groups with regard to the original hypothesis, i.e., their failure to perceive a 'conflict of subcultures,' there were significant variations in their scholastic achievement. Hence the question arose: What correlations, if any, might be found between the relative scholastic performance of each group and the other characteristics brought out by our interviews? To facilitate comparison of subcultures, we quantified the most important variables in our study, a process not envisioned in our original program.

In addition, and as already indicated in our interim report, a review of tapes had revealed a variety of basic 'recipes' for coming to terms with the world. These variations were evident not only in a comparison of the 'profile' of different groups, but also seemed to distinguish the more successful from the less successful students within each group. To quote from our interim report:

> Although our study was not designed to explore the character structure or world view of our respondents, we find that many tapes reveal certain basic 'recipes' for coming to terms with the social world. There are those who always operate on a "don't bother me and I won't bother you" principle. Others have a clearly manipulative outlook on all social relationships. There are the traditionalists, who structure the world in terms of rather rigid and primitive maxims and who tend to polarize humanity into the 'right' and the 'wrong' kinds of people. There are those who cannot tolerate authority in any form, and those who must always please everybody. Last but not least, there is a minority that approaches life with a certain measure of confidence and flexibility, a pattern more prevalent among our middle class control group.(11)

In other words, we found that we had to consider not only a variety of lower class subcultures, but also variations within, no less than between subcultures.

The modest grant for the study, based upon our original plans, was in no way adequate for this extended analysis. After the termination of the grant, the work was carried on by the writer and a student assistant on a part-time basis, and could not be completed in time for the deadline of this report. The following pages, therefore, represent a compromise between our original and our ultimate objectives. They show the responses of our subjects to questions concerning the world of home and school respectively; and they indicate why the subjects' 'definition of the situation' differs from what one might expect on the basis of the hypothesis upon which this study was based. The report further shows the major differences and similarities between four subcultures (representing a total of 110 interviews), and discusses the implications of these differences. The analysis of variations within subcultures has not progressed sufficiently to be presented at this time.

As noted earlier, this study was planned as a pilot project involving only qualitative analysis of the data. However, quantifications of major variables are presented in tabular form in order to highlight the relative importance of different characteristics and 'themes' and to indicate the degree of internal consistency between responses of subjects in each subculture over a wide range of topics. Unfortunately, budgetary limitations did not allow a more adequate statistical treatment of the data.

Method of Study

Prior to the collection of the interviews upon which this study is based, the writer conducted a seminar on The Subculture of Social Strata in the United States, in which pretest interviews were conducted by students, and analyzed in class.

On the basis of this seminar, an interviewing guide was developed, and four graduate students were selected to serve as interviewers in the project proper, and to participate in the initial analysis of the tapes.

A copy of the interviewing guide for lower class respondents is attached. (Because of circumstances beyond our control, some questions had to be omitted in the middle class interviews.) All interviews were tape recorded; the average length of the interviews was about one hour.

Interviewers were allowed flexibility. Pretests had clearly indicated that a good deal of leeway had to be given interviewers in order to enable them to quickly move away from questions that were either meaningless to a particular respondent, or touched upon matters about which he was obviously uncomfortable or sensitive. At the same time, interviewers were also instructed to follow up any point spontaneously touched upon by the respondents which seemed germaine to the inquiry. In order to further establish rapport between interviewer and respondent, the subjects were assured complete anonymity, and promised that there would be no attempt to contact either their parents or teachers.

As noted earlier, all interviewers were graduate students who had participated in the pretest seminar. Three of the interviewers were white; one was Negro. Despite the fact that most of our lower class respondents were nonwhites, a comparison of the tapes seems to indicate that differences between the responses are not to be accounted for by the interviewer's ethnicity, but rather by characteristic differences in subculture or 'personal themes.' (Whether the importance of using Negro interviewers with Negro respondents has been generally overrated, or whether this is true only with regard to the type of questions asked in the present study, we do not know. It is interesting to note, however, that in most of our own interviews--those conducted by whites as well as by the Negro interviewer--there was a total lack of black militancy, even with regard to topics directly concerning the race issue. Respondents with a stronger commitment to 'black consciousness' may well have responded differently to white and black interviewers. Hence, this aspect of our interviews, which, one must remember, were conducted over a year ago, may no longer be valid today.)

The data presented in the following are taken from summary reports on each interview prepared either by the interviewer himself or by another graduate student. These summaries were written according to a coding guide which made it possible to tabulate certain items for the purpose of quantitative comparison. It must be remembered, however, that, due to flexibility allowed interviewers in use of the interviewing guide, information on all items in the code could not always be gathered from each tape.

The interviews themselves were conducted in settings ranging from private homes and community centers, public and parochial schools, to a correctional institution for young offenders.

Subjects

For the purpose of this report, we selected four groups which represent fairly homogeneous subcultures.

Three of these groups were interviewed in their schools. Subjects were selected at random by a teacher or guidance counselor from among those students who happened to have a free period. This created certain problems with regard to the age and sex composition of our sample, but, under the circumstances, it was the only way in which we could gain access to a sufficiently large number of subjects. In the case of the fourth group (later referred to as Prospect Hill), the interviews were conducted by a Negro graduate student in her home town of Baltimore. The subjects were contacted with the aid of recreational centers, OEO sponsored summer programs, and a teacher in the Baltimore public school system who contacted subjects from among those who had been her pupils in remedial reading classes.

To protect the anonymity of respondents, we shall use the following pseudonyms for the four subcultures described in this report: (Initials in parenthesis correspond to abbreviations that will be used in the statistical tables.) Bayview (BV); Market Street (MS); Prospect Hill (PH); and High Towers. (HT).

The remainder of this section presents some background information concerning these groups, based on the two variables by which they can be classified: the 'culture of the home' (i.e., social class), and the 'culture of the school' (i.e., the distinction between a single and a multipurpose school).

Bayview Unstable lower class Single-purpose school

Bayview is a 'special' Junior High School in the New York City public school system, to which students with serious behavioral or educational problems are transferred from regular public schools. At the time our interviews were conducted, Bayview was clearly a 'single-purpose' school, with emphasis being placed upon helping the student to enter or return to a regular high school and to attain his high school diploma. This emphasis on 'getting your diploma' was used to mitigate the stigma of being transferred out of the regular public school by stressing the school's concern for the student, the advantage of smaller classes, strict but task-oriented discipline, etc. The data would indicate that this 'definition of the situation,' which seems to have been adopted throughout the school, and which was strongly endorsed by a well-liked principal, succeeded to a surprising degree. Bayview students, despite their negative attitude toward the educational process in general, and despite their resentment of certain restrictive rules which are not present in other public schools, often expressed appreciation of the special chance and special attention given them at this school.

In terms of occupation of parents and the general impression derived from the data, Bayview as well as Market Street respondents will be designated as 'unstable lower class.' This term is used in preference to 'lower lower class' since one of the important factors which distinguishes these two groups from Prospect Hill respondents seems to be not so much the socioeconomic status of their parents as the nature of the communities in which they live. The term 'unstable' is, therefore, being used in the same sense in which some researchers note a difference between stable and unstable slums in which equal conditions of economic deprivation prevail.(12)

The Bayview students are clearly the most alienated group in the sample. That this condition exists independently of the school is evident in our data on family relationships and other indicators of 'social competence.' Whether Bayview, as a special school, further accentuates this trait, or whether it manages to alleviate it in some measure, is a question which because of the subjective nature of the data, we cannot answer. We can say, however, that no other group in the study seems to evidence so great a sense of a massively oppressive and hostile environment. To what extent this feeling of being "a stranger and afraid in a world I never made" is a reflection of reality, and to what extent it is a projection onto the environment of the personal problems of these young people, we cannot say.

Market Street Unstable lower class Multipurpose school

Market Street is a 'special service school' (grades 6-9) in the New York City public school system, i.e., a regular Junior High School which because it is located in a low income area, is supposed to have special personnel for a number of psychological and remedial services and to offer a number of after-school activities that are not part of the regular public school curriculum.

Market Street respondents are, by any available index, in the 'unstable' lower class; yet they offer a refreshing contrast to Bayview students. Although their abilities and life chances may be no better than those of their Bayview peers, the walls of the prison house have not yet closed in on them so tightly--a fact most dramatically reflected in their (possibly quite unrealistic) educational plans.

While the responses of Bayview, Prospect Hill, and High Towers subjects fall into fairly consistent patterns, the analysis of the data presented in the following sections of this report often shows Market Street students exhibiting a set of mixed responses. This is probably due to the particular 'cognitive style' of this group which comes through more clearly in a review of complete interviews than in the quantified data used in this report. Our Market Street sample clearly exhibits a 'relational' conceptual style, i.e., a high degree of field dependency, many descriptive and ego-involved responses, and a high percentage of polar judgments with regard to people and social norms. To some extent, the responses of all of our lower class subjects are more 'relational' and less 'analytical' than those of our middle class control group. Yet Market Street students exhibit this conceptual style to a much higher degree than do our Bayview and

Prospect Hill samples.

A series of studies reported by Rosalie Cohen(13) have shown that a 'relational' mode of cognition is closely related to participation in primary groups in which statuses and roles are not clearly articulated, whereas preference for a more 'analytic' style seems to correlate with participation in more formally structured groups. This finding might explain the difference in cognitive style among our lower class subjects. Market Street respondents are more closely tied to their families than are Bayview subjects, yet they lack the countervailing influence of participation in structured community and peer group activities evident in Prospect Hill residents.

The suggestion could be made that this difference is due in part to the fact that Market Street subjects are younger than the other two lower class groups. However, if we compare them with High Towers students whose modal age is only six months ahead of them, we find far fewer traces of 'relational' thinking in our highly 'analytical' middle class sample. In other words, the strongly 'relational' conceptual style of Market Street subjects must be seen not only in terms of attachment to the family as a factor of age, but also in terms of differences between families on different class levels. As the paper by Cohen, quoted above, points out,(14) lower class families are more likely to exhibit a pattern in which critical functions are shared or performed indiscriminately (a pattern which correlates with 'relational' styles) while middle class families show a more structured assignment of roles and statuses (which correlates with 'analytical' conceptual styles).

Market Street itself holds up to the student no particular educational or occupational goal, and it seems to have little influence on the 'official world view' of our respondents. Even judging by interviews with students who--both in age and academic problems--closely resemble the Bayview sample, the influence of this 'multipurpose' school would appear to be minimal.

Prospect Hill   Stable lower class   Multipurpose schools

The respondents grouped together under the designation Prospect Hill attend a variety of schools both in the 'inner city' of Baltimore, Maryland, and in an adjacent all Negro community.

All Negro Junior High School	21	subjects
All Negro Vocational High School	2	
Predominantly Negro Junior High School	5	
Integrated elementary or Junior High School	2	
Total	30	subjects

The original purpose of including this group in the study was to provide some control for the less than perfect interviewing situation in New York where white interviewers dealt with a predominantly non-white sample and interviews were conducted in the school setting. Here interviews were conducted by a Negro graduate student born and reared in the area, and the setting was either a community center or a private home.

As noted earlier, difference in the ethnicity of the interviewer and the interviewing setting seemed to produce no significant variations in patterns of communication. However, there were obvious differences between this group and the two New York lower class samples in linguistic and cognitive style, interpersonal relations, scholastic achievement, and perception of self. It was the striking contrast between these Baltimore and the lower class New York tapes which led to the decision to enlarge our analysis into a comparison of the various subcultures found in our study.

As we shall show below, a final tabulation of parental occupations and a very rough estimate of relative parental educational attainments would indicate that between 15 and 20 per cent of the Baltimore parents may have occupations above the blue or lower white collar levels represented by the lower class New York samples. Similarly, though our information on the educational achievements of the New York lower class parents is very sketchy, it would seem that our Baltimore group has something of an edge on this count also. On the other hand, in terms of ethnic status and broken homes, the three groups show no significant differences.

The slightly higher parental occupational and educational levels of the Baltimore sample would not, however, seem sufficient to explain the significant differences between this and the lower class New York groups. We would hypothesize, rather, that these very marked differences reflect the contrast between a stable and an unstable environment on fairly similar class levels. There is no doubt that the cities from which the project's samples were drawn and the life styles of the Black communities within these cities differ in many important respects. Even by the internal evidence or our interviews--such as references to parents who have held the same job for ten years or more; the greater contact with the extended family; church attendance; participation in community affairs, etc.--it appears that these young people come from a more stable and, in some ways, more traditional environment than our New York subjects. This impression was further confirmed by the interviewer who has lived in both localities and who stressed the absence in New York City of some aspects of community life she had known in the Black community of Baltimore.

As for the schools which Baltimore respondents attend, they are essentially what we have termed 'multipurpose' schools. While it is understood that completion of high school is essential, there is not the same single minded emphasis on 'getting your diploma' that was found at Bayview. Neither is it taken for granted that all students will attend college as is the assumption at High Towers. Yet in contrast to Market Street, Prospect Hill schools seem to have a greater influence on our subjects' educational and vocational plans along the general line of 'making something of yourself.' Interviews give the impression that the largely Negro teaching and counseling staffs at Prospect Hill schools often relate to the future of their charges as part of the struggle for the improvement of a minority group in American society; while the New York staffs seem more likely to view the student a priori as one socially and economically handicapped whose life chances must be viewed in a 'realistic' light.

High Towers   Middle class   Single-purpose school

The original project proposal did not provide for a middle class control group to be included in the study. However, during pretests we found ourselves wondering whether certain responses were indeed 'typically lower class' or whether they reflected attitudes about the school and the educational process in general which might also be found among students in other social strata. As a result, additional interviews were conducted with thirty middle class students of which 20 interviews with students at High Towers are included in this report.

We have designated High Towers students as middle class though upper middle class might be a more adequate designation. Many of their parents belong to what is increasingly referred to as the 'new middle class' of university trained professionals and executives. Furthermore, the economic status of High Towers parents is reflected in the fact that they can afford to send their children to this fairly expensive private school--although, given the state of public education in New York City, it is quite possible that some of them have brought considerable sacrifices to send their children to private school.

High Towers itself clearly qualifies as a single-purpose school. In order to parallel the questions asked of lower class subjects, the interviewer inquired whether the subjects intended to complete high school. High Towers respondents considered this a rather ludicrous question. As one put it succinctly: "If you don't intend to go to college, you shouldn't be here." A number of respondents also felt that High Towers' reputation depends on its ability to get as large a percentage of students as possible into a 'good college.' Indeed, admission to 'a good college' rather than just 'college' (the standard response of those lower class subjects who intended to continue beyond the elementary grades) would seem to be the goal which leads many parents to send their children to High Towers and which implicitly or explicitly 'defines the situation' for many teachers and students.

Academic Performance

In terms of school performance and adjustment to the school setting, our four subcultures can be lined up along a continuum. Since by virtue of its being a 'special' school, Bayview serves not a random sample of unstable lower class youths but a group representing a concentration of problems found in such an environment, it is not surprising that it should rank lowest on the scale. Next comes the second unstable lower class group, Market Street, followed by the stable lower class sample, Prospect Hill. High Towers finally indicates the upper end of the scale.

Although the expected differences in scholastic performance are reflected in information regarding grades in specific subjects or academic averages, many of our lower class New York respondents were too hazy on that score to compare their responses with those of the remaining two subcultures. (But in passing it might be noted that one-third of Prospect Hill respondents mentioned that they had been on their school's 'honor' or 'success' rolls, a fact never reported by respondents in the other two lower class groups.) Data do, however, provide the following indicators for a comparison of the relative performance and school adjustment of our four groups.

Relative to their age, Prospect Hill and High Towers respondents average a higher grade level than Bayview and Market Street students. This despite the fact that High Towers' academic standards are far more demanding than are those of the public schools which the other three groups attend.

TABLE I

GRADE LEVEL RELATIVE TO AGE

	BV (N 30)	MS (N 30)	PH (N 30)	HT (N 20)
	Age 12-13			
Grades 6-7	71%	100%	40%	36%
Grades 8-9	29	--	60	64
	Age 14-16			
Grades 6-7	--%	50%	--%	--%
Grades 8-9	100	50	64	44
Grades 10-11	--	--	36	56
	Total Sample			
Average Age	14.4 years	13.3 years	14.3 years	13.7 years
Average Grade	8.4	6.9	8.9	8.4
Difference between age and grade	6.0	6.4	5.4	5.3

Subcultural differences in adjustment to the school environment and in scholastic performance are also reflected in the four groups' responses to questions concerning truancy and homework, and they follow the same pattern--60 per cent of Bayview students report playing hooky "once, sometimes or often," followed by Market Street (53 per cent), Prospect Hill (21 per cent) and High Towers (10 per cent); 45 per cent of Bayview students report that they do not always complete their homework, followed by Market Street (40 per cent), Prospect Hill (23 per cent) and High Towers (10 per cent).

TABLE II

TRUANCY

	BV (N 30)	MS (N 30)	PH (N 23)	HT (N 20)
Never played hooky	10%	47%	79%	90%
Once or sometimes	30	53	17	10
Often	30		4	--
Not in this but in previous school	30	--	--	--
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%

TABLE III

HOMEWORK

	BV (N 30)	MS (N 30)	PH (N 30)	HT (N 20)
Respondents who report that they do not always complete their homework	45%	40%	23%	10%

As might be expected, responses concerning the extent to which subjects like or dislike school are ranged along the same continuum with 54 per cent of Bayview students reporting that they dislike school, followed by 20 per cent of Market Street students, 13 per cent of Prospect Hill students and 5 per cent of High Towers students.

TABLE IV

LIKING SCHOOL

	BV (N 30)	MS (N 30)	PH (N 30)	HT (N 20)
Like school	28%	43%	52%	70%
Dislike school	54	20	13	5
Not clear or ambivalent	18	37	35	25
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%

But here one thing about Bayview students should be noted. Despite their negative attitude toward school in general, many of these youths indicate that they prefer this 'special' school to the general public schools they had previously attended. Of respondents in this group, 60 per cent said they liked Bayview better than their old school; 20 per cent said they liked it less. (In the remaining 20 per cent of the interviews, this question was not asked.)

When we turn to the educational aspirations of these youths, we find similarly marked differences among the four groups. The following summary indicates that the continuum of levels of academic achievement and adjustment is also reflected in college plans:

TABLE V

COLLEGE PLANS

	BV (N 30)	MS (N 30)	PH (N 30)	HT (N 20)
No college plans	73%	43%	33%	--%
Vague college plans or "some college"	20	27	37	10
Expect definitely to go to college	7	30	30	90
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%

Demographic and Related Variables

TABLE VI

ETHNICITY

	BV (N 30)	MS (N 30)	PH (N 30)	HT (N 20)
White	17%	3%	--%	90%
Non-white	83	97	100	10
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%

All respondents in the Prospect Hill sample were Negro.

The two lower class New York samples included Puerto Rican as well as Negro students. While direct questions regarding ethnicity were not asked, interviewers estimated (from references to Spanish spoken in the home, relatives in Puerto Rico, etc.) that approximately 40 per cent of the Market Street sample were Puerto Ricans, and the percentage of Puerto Ricans among non-whites in the Bayview sample was somewhat smaller. Obviously the effect of ethnicity in such a sample is complicated by our inability to differentiate between country of birth of subjects or their parents. For example, one Bayview subject who is in many ways atypical in his command of English as well as in his general attitude toward education mentioned by chance that his mother was from the West Indies, a fact which may well account for the difference between this youth and the majority of Bayview subjects. Here again it is evident that the terms Negro or lower class (or both in combination) do not stand for one but for a number of subcultures. Similarly, the simple dichotomy 'white, non-white' may also be misleading. In the Bayview sample, for instance, three of the five white respondents mentioned that they had been in correctional or mental institution or were under the care of a psychiatrist or probation officer, but only four of twenty-five non-white respondents mentioned this fact. While this is volunteered information and may not give us an accurate picture, it would nevertheless seem to indicate that when white students attend 'special' schools they are more likely than non-whites to present severe problems of mental health and deviance.

As to High Towers respondents, of the twenty subjects in this group, fifteen were Jewish, three were white gentiles, one was Negro and one was Chinese.

According to our personal contacts, Bayview and High Towers samples would seem to be a fair reflection of the ethnic composition of these two schools, though the percentage of non-whites in the total student body of High Towers is probably somewhat lower. In the case of Market Street, our contact estimated that about 75 per cent of the students in the regular curriculum from which our sample is taken are non-white, which would mean that in this instance they are overrepresented.

TABLE VII

SEX

	BV (N 30)	MS (N 30)	PH (N 30)	HT (N 20)
Male	100%	80%	60%	55%
Female	--	20	40	45
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%

In the case of Bayview, we were dealing with an all-male school. In the remaining cases, interviewers were instructed to attempt to obtain a fairly balanced male-female ratio. However, as noted earlier, selection of respondents had to be left up to informal contacts. Under the circumstances, it was deemed inadvisable to reject a subject once he had been sent to an interview and, as a result, we seem to find ourselves with an overrepresentation of males.

TABLE VIII

FAMILY STATUS

	BV (N 30)	MS (N 30)	PH (N 30)	HT (N 20)
Father Present	60%	64%	57%	75%
Stepfather or 'Uncle'	7	--	--	--
Foster Father	7	--	--	--
No Father or Father Substitute	26	36	43	25
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%

While academic performance and adjustment the school environment vary considerably among our three lower class groups, the percentage of homes in which the biological father is not present is fairly consistent. This would seem to confirm the very strong impression one gets from a review of individual interviews that (1) the absence or presence of the father in and of itself is a less decisive factor in school performance than is often assumed and that (2) the correlation between a high percentage of homes without fathers and a high score on various indices of social disorganization found in statistical reports on lower class Negro families may not always be a causal one.(15) Our data would rather tend to confirm a finding by Deutsch and Associates who, by constructing a 'deprivation index' and correlating it with both Socioeconomic Status and reading ability, found that while absence of father correlated significantly with class, it did not show a significant correlation with reading ability; that, on the other hand, conversation during dinner and extent of cultural activities with adults did correlate significantly with both Socioeconomic status and reading ability.(16) As we shall attempt to show, our data would seem to indicate a similar correlation between what we shall term more broadly 'social competence' and patterns of family interaction--rather than a correlation between 'social competence' and homes in which a father is present or absent.

In addition, our data point to still another aspect of family status not usually referred to in the debate over the Negro family; namely, the presence or absence of the natural mother. Although our sample is too limited to draw decisive conclusions from it, we note that in the case of Bayview respondents, the most alienated group in the study, 17 per cent live in homes in which the biological mother has been replaced by a substitute (such as a stepmother, foster mother or female relative) as against only three per cent in the other three groups.

Since there is a correlation between social class and family size in most industrial societies, we present the relevant data for our four groups. These figures indicate that there would seem to be a greater tendency for Bayview respondents, with their greater incidence of emotional disturbance and deviants, to come from larger families. But even more significant in this contest is a comparison of the status of respondents within the age range of their siblings.

TABLE IX

FAMILY SIZE

	BV (N 30)	MS (N 30)	PH (N 30)	HT (N 20)
Up to three siblings	50%	40%	54%	90%
Up to five siblings	20	43	30	10
Six or more siblings	30	17	16	--
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%

TABLE X

AGE OF RESPONDENTS AS COMPARED TO SIBLINGS

	BV (N 26)	MS (N 25)	PH (N 30)	HT (N 20)
Only child	8%	--%	10%	30%
Youngest child	16	12	27	30
Oldest child	16	28	27	10
Older and younger siblings	60	60	36	30
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%

A study by Sheldon and Eleanor Glueck has found that 'middle children' are more likely to engage in delinquent activities than are only oldest or youngest children.(17) While the conclusions they have drawn from the study have been questioned, it is nevertheless interesting to note that the unstable lower class respondents in the present study are more likely to be 'middle children' than are those in the two other groups.

Of the lower class groups in the present study, only 8 per cent of Bayview respondents, 4 per cent of Market Street respondents and 17 per cent of Prospect Hill respondents have fathers whose occupations may be considered lower middle or upper middle class.

More significant, however, is the difference in percentage of factory-worker fathers among the three groups: Bayview, 11 per cnet; Market Street, 14 per cent; Prospect Hill, 48 per cent. While Prospect Hill respondents are not entirely clear as to the specific positions their fathers hold in factories, many refered to the fact that they have held their jobs for many years. By the nature of factories mentioned, we may assume that the fathers' jobs are unionized and thereby stabilized. It would therefore seem to us that the economic difference between the stable and unstable lower class groups is more likely to be found here then in difference in middle class occupations.

TABLE XI

OCCUPATION OF PARENTS

Occupation of Father

	BV (N 26)	MS (N 23)	PH (N 19)	HT (N 20)
Unskilled blue collar (janitor, guard, waiter, etc.)	23%	22%	10%	--%
Factory worker	11	14	48	--
Mechanic, craftsmen	11	38	5	5
Transportation (merchant marine, bus, taxi or truck drivers)	20	--	--	--
Clerical or sales	8	4	5	5
Post office, railroad, fireman, police, etc.	11	4	10	--
Construction worker	8	14	5	--
Owner of small retail store (candy or cleaning store)	8	4	--	--
Own business, executive, higher civil service, teacher, professional, etc.	--	--	17	90
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%

Occupation of Mother

	BV (N 16	MS (N 10)	PH (N 15)	HT (N 7)
Clerical and Sales	13%	--%	13%	29%
Factory worker	18	40	6	--
Unskilled (janitor, cook, waitress)	56	30	46	--
Dressmaker, nurses aide	--	10	14	--
Nurse, teacher	13	20	17	--
Store detective, supervisor recreational center	--	--	14	--
Model, decorator	--	--	--	43
Medical student, professor of archeology	--	--	--	28
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%

Of the middle class control group, 90 per cent of respondents have fathers whose occupations may be considered middle class or better.

Because of the small number of mothers for whom occupations are reported, data are not conclusive. However, so far as jobs above the lower class level are concerned, the pattern seems to be similar to that of fathers: 13 per cent for Bayview, 20 per cent for Market Street, 21 per cent for Prospect Hill, 43 per cent for High Towers.

TABLE XII

EDUCATION OF PARENTS

Education of Father

	BV	MS	PH	HT
Did not complete high school	8	1	7	--
Completed high school	2	2	1	--
Went beyond high school	--	1	4	18
Total	10	4	12	18

Education of Mother

	BV	MS	PH	HT
Did not complete high school	1	1	9	--
Completed high school	7	4	10	2
Went beyond high school	1	1	2	16
Total	9	6	21	18

Although the two lower class New York groups are exceedingly hazy about the educational background of their parents, the table above may give some indication of the overall pattern. (Because of the limited information from the two New York samples,data are given in absolute figures only.)

Findings suggest that Prospect Hill fathers are likely to have a somewhat higher educational level than are fathers of the lower class New York groups, but that the gulf between them and the middle class control group is far more striking then are the differences between them and the other two lower class groups.

One set of questions in the interviews referred to the neighborhood in which the subject lived: how he liked it, what kind of activities were going on, etc. Respondents were grouped in three broad categories: those who thought they lived in a good or "OK" neighborhood; those who thought they lived in a poor neighborhood; and those who had mixed or unclear feelings on the subject.

TABLE XIII

NEIGHBORHOOD

	BV (N 30)	MS (N 30)	PH (n 30)	HT (N 20)
Good or OK	60%	20%	57%	80%
Poor	27	57	16	10
Ambivalent or not clear	13	23	27	10
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%

As noted earlier, Bayview as a 'special school' draws its students from a wide area; therefore, we have no way of telling to what extent the responses in this group reflect reality.

In the case of Market Street and High Towers, where the neighborhoods from which the respondents come is known to the interviewers, the high scores on poor and good neighborhoods respectively seem quite realistic.

With regard to the Baltimore sample, the following comment in the final report of the interviewer would seem instructive:

> The subjects, many of them residents of the 'inner city' and of low income housing projects, seem to like their neighborhoods in spite of the rowdiness, the noise, and the unruliness in many of the areas. This attachment seems to be traceable to the fact that these are the areas they know best. They have lived in them for many years, they know the people, they are 'comfortable' here. The attitude of the subjects reminded the interviewer of a blues-type song called 'Tobacco Road' which includes the following lines: 'I despise you 'cause you're filthy but I love you because you're my home.' The familiarity of 'home' in the 'inner city' was very important to these youngsters.

This reaction on the part of our respondents points once again to the human problems of urban renewal stressed by many critics of large-scale 'slum removal.'(18) One of the Baltimore respondents posed the question squarely. Complimenting the interviewer on the neighborhood in which she lived but noting the absence of suitable 'hang-outs' such as candy or drug stores, he added: "If I had to live here, I would not know what to do."

RESULTS

The Purpose of Education

One of the important components of the actor's 'definition of the situation' is his interpretation of the purpose of the enterprise in which he is engaged. Hence the first data we wish to present are responses to questions such as "What is the purpose of education?" "What good is education other than for getting a job?" "Why do you go to school?" "Does education help you outside of school?" Etc.

TABLE XIV

PURPOSE OF EDUCATION
(Per cent of respondents)

	BV (N 30)	MS (N 30)	PH (N 30)	HT (N 20)
Can't get a job (or a good job) without it	90%	80%	93%	45%
It helps you in raising a family	10	10	17	5
Helps you to know what is going on	20	--	17	40
Teaches you how to deal with people	7	27	27	25
Important for financial success, for getting ahead, for doing what you want to do in life	3	23	30	65
You need to know how to read and write (apart from job)	10	27	30	--
So you won't be a bum	10	13	7	--
To be a better citizen	--	--	10	10
To improve your habits & manners	--	10	--	10
Gives you something to do	3	20	--	10
Otherwise you'd be working	3	--	--	--
Otherwise everybody would be fighting	3	--	--	--
Education is a source of personal satisfaction, stimulation, etc.	--	--	--	45

Total exceeds 100 per cent because of multiple answers.

The great majority of all three lower-class groups tell us that the purpose of education is 'To get a job' (Bayview, 90 per cent; Market Street, 80 per cent; Prospect Hill, 93 per cent). The unstable lower class Bayview and Market Street youths are more apt then are the stable lower class Prospect Hill youths to also suggest that going to school "Keeps you from being a bum" and "Gives you something to do." And a few Bayview students, alone among all respondents, give us this interesting observation: If it weren't for school, "You'd be working" or "Everybody would be fighting." On the other hand, the stable lower class Prospect Hill youths are more apt then are Bayview and Market Street youths to suggest that going to school "Helps you in raising a family," "Is important for financial success, for getting ahead, for doing what you want to do in life," and "Helps you be a better citizen."

The middle class High Towers youth view education in a strikingly different manner. In contrast to lower class youths, less then half (45 per cent) tell us that the purpose of education is "To get a job"; and far more High Towers students suggest that education "Helps you know what is going on"; "Is important for financial success, for getting ahead, for doing what you want to do in life"; "Is a source of personal satisfaction, stimulation, etc." (The last, incidentally, was mentioned only by High Towers students.)

These findings would seem to support those proponents of the 'conflict of subcultures' hypothesis who argue that the root of the problem is in the different attitudes toward education evidenced by the middle and lower classes. For example, reporting the findings of a study in which questions concerning education were asked of a class-stratified sample, Ephraim H. Mizruchi notes: "Our earlier findings . . . suggest that education is more highly valued by the middle class as an *end value* then it is by the lower classes. . . . There is a marked *tendency* for instrumental perception of education to increase inversely with social class."(19) (Italics in the original.)

There is no doubt that the present data would certainly seem to reflect a higher 'instrumental perception of education' on the part of lower class respondents. However, it is our own opinion that comparison of lower and middle class responses in this regard must be viewed within the context of what Maslow terms the 'hierarchy of human needs.'(20)

If the lower class child tends to emphasize, while the middle class child does not even mention, the need to know how to read and write, we would suggest that this may well be because these skills, however basic, are not necessarily endemic to the lower classes and are, therefore, viewed in terms of a 'need.' Our own lower class respondents often note for example, that people who lack these skills tend to get cheated by lawyers, store owners and officials. Similarly, the lower class youth is likely to view the means-end relationship between education and 'getting a job' or a 'good job' in equally first-hand and self-evident terms.

That the middle class student on the other hand, neither views education primarily as a means to a job nor mentions the necessity to read and write would suggest not that he gives no weight to the pragmatic value of education but, rather, that he simply takes such matters for granted. For the High Towers student, the need is not viewed in terms of competence in basic skills (everyone has this) nor, even, in terms of getting into college (everyone does this). The need, rather, is to get into a 'good' college. Similarly, for the High Towers student, education is linked not simply with 'a job,' or even with 'a good job,' as in the case of our lower class youths, but with 'the job you want.' To an equal degree, it is linked with financial success, getting ahead, or getting what you want out of life. That the road from High Towers via a 'good' college to 'the job you want' is destined inter alia to also lead to 'a good job' (in the sense in which this term is used by lower class respondents) need hardly be spelled out. This point has been dealt with at some length because our own feeling is that many unwarranted conclusions have been drawn from pre-coded questionnaires taping class-linked differences in attitudes toward education on what is essentially a 'forced choice' basis. Mizruchi, for example, states: ". . . although our lower class subjects are aware of the utility of education as a means for getting ahead, that they do not view it as a high end value does limit their chances for even modest advancement. We must agree with Hyman that the lower class population does thus share a self-imposed tendency to nonachievement of success goals."(21)

We would take issue with this conclusion on two counts:

1. If middle class respondents were not implicitly aware of the pragmatic purpose of education they, too, would fall short of prevalent standards of 'success' in contemporary American society. The person who sees education only as an end value and who never gives thought to the question of whether the subjects he studies have pragmatic value in the academic, scholastic or professional marketplace may eventually furnish his apartment with diplomas but probably with very little else. In fact, we would respectfully question whether--given the 'publish or perish' syndrom--Mizruchi's own study was written without benefit of any pragmatic considerations.

2. If a pragmatic attitude toward education is, in itself, an obstacle to success, it would seem odd that the percentage of respondents mentioning 'a job' as a purpose of education should be highest not among our most alienated group, i.e. our Bayview respondents but among the group which by all indications is the most promising candidate for social mobility, i.e. our Prospect Hill respondents. We believe

that the answer to this riddle may be found in the following comparison:

	BV	MS	PH	HT
Total number of responses to the question "What is the purpose of education?"	48	65	70	61
Less responses referring to 'job'	27	24	28	9
Responses to 'purpose of education' other than 'job'	21	41	42	52
Per cent of respondents who definitely expect to go to college	7%	30%	30%	90%

It would seem to us no coincidence that the number of responses other than 'job' as a 'purpose of education' and the percentage of respondents planning a college career run in the same direction--even though the 'job' responses by themselves do not. What is at work here, we believe, is a version of what Hyman Rodman has called "the lower class value stretch." Rodman notes:

> Lower class persons come to tolerate and eventually to evaluate favorably certain deviations from the middle class values. In this way they need not be continually frustrated by their failure to live up to unattainable values. The resultant is a stretched value system with a low degree of commitment to all the values within the range, including the dominant and middle class values. This is what I suggest as the major lower class value change, rather than a change in which the middle class values are abandoned and flouted.(22)

While we would agree with Rodman as far as the acceptance of 'deviant' values on the part of lower class individuals is concerned, we would note that the above table (and a number of others to be presented later) show that the opposite process may also take place. Without abandoning the dominant lower class value of education (as a means to a job) our Market Street and Prospect Hill subjects tend to include a larger number of additional items as part of their definition of the purpose of education. In other words, while they show no inclination to abandon a characteristic lower class value, a 'value stretch' does indeed take place which, in some instances, runs in a direction more closely approximating responses of our middle class group. This trend is clearly reflected in the item 'financial success, getting ahead, doing what you want in life'--the purpose most frequently mentioned by the middle class respondents.

We might also note here that findings concerning respondents' views of the purpose of education anticipate certain characteristics of the four groups which are reflected in subsequent tables and which even now suggest the internal consistency of the four subcultures. Of special interest in this context are responses in the category 'education teaches you how to deal with people.' These responses clearly reflect the restricted interpersonal relations of our Bayview sample; at the same time, despite what we shall see to be their very satisfactory interpersonal relations, our middle class controls score no higher on this point than do the Market Street and Prospect Hill subjects. This would seem to be in line with Gans' observation that lower class persons tend to be more people-oriented then are middle class individuals,(23) a fact clearly evident in subsequent data on attitudes towards the school and its personnel. Similarly, the fact that the responses 'the purpose of school is to help you to know what is going on' is not given by our Market Street respondents is altogether consistent with our observation that this group is still most closely bound to authority relationships with significant adults and has very little orientation to the broader environment (a fact also reflected in that this is the only lower class group to mention the 'improvement of habits and manners' as a purpose of education). Conversely, the fact that of the three lower class groups only the Prospect Hill sample mentions 'to be a better citizen' as a purpose of education is wholly consistent with the great protensity of that group to participate in community affairs, which we shall find evident in a later table. One item on the present Table XIV which is somewhat deceptive is the response 'school gives you something to do' which later, in a different context, is also given by a significant number of subjects in our middle class control group. We would suspect that this response given by both our Market Street and High Towers samples but not by the two other samples, may be in part a reflection of differences in age, with the two older groups having a wider choice of alternate social activities.

Before concluding this section, we might well ask: How do responses regarding the purpose of education relate to the original purpose of this study, i.e. to the extent to which subjects are exposed to a conflict of subcultures? As we have shown, lower and middle class subjects tend to have different views on the purpose of education, with lower class respondents stressing its 'means' value; middle class respondents mentioning, to a far greater degree, its 'end' value. Might this indicate a 'conflict' in the definition of the purpose of education as seen by the lower class student and his middle class teacher in the urban public school?

Recent reports from the 'blackboard jungle' would seem to indicate that the teacher's perception of 'the purpose of education' depends not only on his own social class position but also on his perception of the student and the conditions under which he teaches.(24) Where students' reading level is years below that appropriate for their age, where discipline problems and paperwork absorb a great part of the school day, where too many classes are taught by substitutes and 'transferring out' is a frequent topic of conversation, it is hard to think of whatever 'education' does take place nevertheless as 'an end value.' Indeed we would suspect that if we were to interview the teachers of Bayview and Market Street concerning the purpose of education for the group of pupils from which our samples are drawn, they, too, would be likely to stress the importance of the 'means' value of the educational enterprise for this particular type of children.

Aspirations

In the previous section we noted that despite a certain 'value stretch' our lower class respondents seem to share a basic definition of the purpose of education which may be designated as characteristically lower class.

In this section, we shall review three measures of aspirations--educational plans, vocational plans and the Three Wishes Test--and attempt to show that despite significant differences in educational and occupational plans, the concept of 'stretched' values holds true.

The relevant sociological and educational literature presents a great deal of contradictory evidence concerning the aspirations of lower class parents and children.(25) This may be due, in part, to differences in the ways in which the questions are phrased. (In our study, questions concerning educational and occupational plans were purely projective: "What would you like to do?" "What would you want?" "What do you think will happen?") Our data would indicate that there are different degrees of 'realism' among the four subcultures in the study. To the extent to which Bayview and Prospect Hill students give explanations for their vocational or educational plans they tend to mention interests or abilities, advice given by adults inside and outside the school, role models, etc. Market Street respondents, on the other hand, seem much less 'reality oriented' in their occupational choices. One girl wanted to become a physician because she liked the Dr. Kildare program on TV; another student did not want to become a physician (his mother's choice) "because physicians have to give needles and I hate that"; a third student announced that he wanted to become a bookkeeper "because I like books"--and was rather taken aback by the information that this vocation requires the handling of figures; another declared that he wanted to go to college and be an automechanic, a combination which on second thought may not sound quite so odd if one takes into account his rationale: "If I go to college, and I can't find a job as a mechanic, then I can always do something else" --a nice switch on the traditional middle class admonition to young ladies to acquire secretarial skills in case their college education does not lead to a professional career.

In this connection, it is interesting to note that a number of lower class respondents suggested different occupations not as a matter of personal choice to be made at a later date but as alternatives in case one type of employment did not work out. This was more likely to be the case with subjects mentioning low level blue collar occupations then with those mentioning higher level white collar occupations or the professions and would seem to indicate that some of our subjects were well aware of the precarious nature of unskilled or semi-skilled blue collar jobs on the current marketplace. (Only one of our New York respondents, however, explicitly drew the conclusion that in contemporary American society "It is important to learn to work with your head instead of your hands." Others seemed to anticipate a pattern of moving from one relatively marginal job to another which they have undoubtedly observed among many adults about them.)

On the other hand, High Towers respondents were more likely to state that they simply had not yet made up their minds. First, the rest of high school and college was still ahead of them; second, and as some put it, "We don't have enough experience yet." This response points to another difference between our middle and lower class samples which is also reflected in their judgement of their own behavior and their relationship to their parents. The middle class child would seem to be much more self-consciously aware of 'appropriate' social roles and relationships at different stages of the life cycle. Where lower class respondents are taken aback by the question: "Do your parents understand you?" and tend to respond with a more or less mechanical 'yes,' middle class respondents embark on a virtual dissertation on the relationship between adolescents and their parents. Where lower class subjects tent to respond to the question: "What should a boy your age do?" with "stay out of trouble," middle class respondents will refer to such specifics as the proper dating age. In other words, many of our middle class subjects strike us not only as having been brought up 'by the book' but as being quite aware of what 'the book' says.

The following table suggests that in terms of college plans the two groups in the 'multipurpose schools' rank between Bayview, with its emphasis on a high school diploma, and High Towers, with its emphasis on admission to a 'good college.' There are also indications that the educational plans expressed by Prospect Hill respondents are likely to be more 'realistic' then those expressed by Market Street subjects. While 30 per cent of both groups plan to attend a four-year college, an additional 14 per cent of the Prospect Hill group plan to attend college for one or two years in accordance with requirements for a specific occupational goal. Similarly, 23 per cent of the Prospect Hill group plan to attend vocational high schools which, again, are directly related to their occupational plans. In other words, 67 per cent of the Prospect Hill respondents either plan to attend a four-year college program or pursue their education in line with specific occupational goals versus 34 per cent of Bayview students and 30 per cent of the Market Street sample.

TABLE XV

EDUCATIONAL PLANS

	BV (N 30)	MS (N 30)	PH (N 30)	HT (N 20)
Plan to attend four-year college	7%	30%	30%	90%
Plan to attend college for less then four years	--	--	14	--
Vague references to 'going to college'	20	27	23	10
Complete High School only	20	17	10	--
Complete Vocational High School only	27	--	23	--
May drop out of High School	13	13	--	--
Plans not clear	13	13	--	--
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%

That Market Street subjects seem to be the least 'realistic' of our four groups is also reflected in the fact that while they list a larger number of 'definite' or 'possible' occupational choices, they are the least likely to have discussed these choices with their parents. Since both the choice of an occupation and the tendency to discuss these choices with parents and teachers may be related to age and grade level, the following table represents the responses of twenty subjects in each group, all of whom attended seventh and eighth grade.

It is quite possible that the low percentage of Market Street respondents who reported no occupational plans as against the much higher percentage of middle class respondents who "had not yet made up their minds" is a function of the greater 'field dependency' of the Market Street group. It is not so much that they give an 'expected answer' but that they give an answer because it is expected. Indeed, some of the 'imaginative' elaborations of the Market Street group concerning their occupational goals would seem to support this conclusion.

TABLE XVI

OCCUPATIONAL PLANS
(Per cent of respondents)

	BV	MS	PH	HT
	(N 20 for all groups)			
Say they have definite occupational plans	60%	45%	40%	30%
Mention vague occupational plans	30	50	40	40
No occupational plans	10	5	20	30
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%
Discussed plans with parents	50%	21%	59%	78%
Discussed plans with teachers	6	--	35	21

The following table lists all possible occupations mentioned by our subjects exclusive of the armed forces. (In the latter case, it was not always clear whether such references indicated a career choice or only the expectation to serve in accordance with the draft laws.)

TABLE XVII

OCCUPATION AS MENTIONED AS DEFINITE OR "POSSIBLE" CHOICES
(Absolute figures)

	BV	MS	PH	HT
No. of respondents	28	27	28	13
No. of responses	36	45	32	26
Blue Collar and Lower White Collar				
Jobs corps or manpower training	6	--	--	--
Mechanic (auto, TV, etc.)	7	1	5	--
Craftsman (electrician, plumber, welder, carpenter, printer)	3	4	1	--
Dressmaker, beautician	--	--	2	--
Secretary or clerical	2	4	--	--
Civil Service				
Policeman	3	4	--	--
Fireman	2	3	--	--
Welfare Investigator	--	--	1	--
New York City transit system	1	--	--	--

(Continued on next page)

TABLE XVII (Continued)

OCCUPATION AS MENTIONED AS DEFINITE OR "POSSIBLE" CHOICES
(Absolute figures)

	BV	MS	PH	HT
No. of respondents	28	27	28	13
No. of responses	36	45	32	26
Transportation				
Bus or truck driver	2	4	--	--
Pilot	2	1	--	--
Other White Collar Occupations				
Commercial artist	1	2	2	--
Singer, actor	1	2	2	2
Computer programming	1	--	2	--
Radio broadcasting	--	1	--	1
Own store (TV or beauty shop)	--	2	1	--
Dental technician	--	--	1	--
Interior decorator	--	--	1	2
Contractor	--	1	--	--
Sports (professional)	4	1	3	--
Professions or Occupations Usually Requiring a College Degree				
Lawyer	1	3	--	5
Scientist	--	3	--	3
Teacher	--	5	4	3
Nurse	--	1	1	1
Physician	--	2	1	3
Social worker or probation officer	--	--	3	--
Librarian	--	--	1	--
School counselor	--	--	1	--
Architect	--	1	--	1
Philosopher	--	--	--	1
Minister	--	--	--	1
Writer	--	--	--	1
Politician	--	--	--	1
Diplomat	--	--	--	1

Summary
(Per cent of occupations mentioned)

	BV	MS	PH	HT
Blue Collar and Lower White Collar (Incl. civil service, transportation and sports)	89%	49%	37%	--%
Other White Collar Occupations	8	18	29	19
Professions and Others Usually Requiring College	3	33	34	81
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%

In comparing Table XV (Educational Plans) with Table XVII (Occupational Choices) we find certain parallels in levels of expectations for each group which may be brought out by the following juxtaposition of the relevant figures.

TABLE XVIII

EDUCATIONAL VS. OCCUPATIONAL ASPIRATIONS

	BV	MS	PH	HT
Per cent who definitely plan to go to college	7%	30%	30%	90%
Per cent of occupations mentioned usually requiring a full college education	3	33	34	81
Per cent not mentioning college as part of educational plans	73	43	33	--
Per cent of blue collar, lower white collar occupations mentioned (incl. transportation, civil service and sports)	89	49	37	--
Per cent who mention going to college for less than four years or vague references to 'maybe' going to college'	20	27	37	10
Per cent of 'other white collar' occupations mentioned	8	18	29	19

As the above comparison indicates, Bayview and High Towers are polar cases with regard to educational as well as occupational aspirations. In the first instance, educational as well as occupational aspirations are extremely low with 73 per cent of respondents not expecting to go beyond high school and 89 per cent of all occupations mentioned falling into the blue collar or lower white collar categories. In the case of High Towers, on the other hand, 90 per cent of respondents are certain that they will go to college and the rest by no means reject the idea. Similarly, 81 per cent of all occupations mentioned definitely require college and the rest are in what we have designated as 'other,' i.e. more prestigious or promising, white collar occupations.

Our Market Street and Prospect Hill samples fall in between these two polar positions. In both groups, 30 per cent mention that they definitely expect to go to college; and of all occupations mentioned by the two groups, 33 and 34 per cent respectively are those which usually require a college education. The difference between the two groups, however, becomes evident on the level of 'intermediate' aspirations, i.e. in the different percentages of those who mentioned 'some college' and, correspondingly, 'other' white collar occupations which, though not necessarily requiring a college degree, have a higher social status. It is on these intermediary steps toward educational and occupational mobility that stable lower subjects score higher then all other groups.

While in terms of occupational and educational aspirations, Prospect Hill respondents present a very different picture then the Bayview group, it is interesting to note that this difference is not as marked for our third measure of aspirations, the Three Wishes Test. The following table summarizes responses of our three lower class groups to the question: "If you had three wishes, for what would you wish?" (Unfortunately, this question was not asked in our middle class interviews.)

TABLE XIX

THREE WISHES TEST
(Per cent of responses)

	BV (N 53)	MS (N 64)	PH (N 84)
Material			
Home or place to live	22%	6%	13%
Money	21	10	20
Good job or own store	10	11	4
Clothes, bicycle, swimming pool, car	25	11	21
Pet or horses	--	--	2
Travel	--	9	5
	78%	47%	65%
Personal Qualities			
Be famous, be somebody, be brilliant, be successful, be "middle class"	2%	2%	8%
Be liked, have friends	--	2	3
Be good, happy, attractive, good at sports	--	5	--
	2%	9%	11%
Family Centered Wishes			
To be reunited with family members	2%	5%	1%
Money for relatives	5	4	5
Marry and have children	4	3	1
Family always be healthy and stay together	--	5	1
Less family discipline and sibling fights	--	3	--
	11%	20%	8%
Educational			
No school, be out of school, be grown up	7%	1%	6%
Have a good education or go to college	--	5	--
Integrated schools with equal opportunity	--	--	6
Better schools or school of my own	--	2	1
	7%	8%	13%
Humanitarian Concerns			
Stop war, rid world of disease, help others	2%	6%	3%
Others	--	10	--
	100%	100%	100%

Here again we have a reflection of the younger age of our Market Street sample with its lower response rate on material matters, its higher degree of 'imagination' concerning family-centered wishes, the wish to be 'good' or 'happy,' etc. What we would stress, however, are certain similarities between the two older groups which again point to a 'value stretch' rather than a retreat from lower class values on the part of our Prospect Hill respondents. Both the Bayview and Prospect Hill groups are primarily concerned with material possessions. However, the relative weight of these items in the total pattern of wishes is somewhat less for the stable lower class respondents whose interviews include a good many more references to personal ambitions and personal qualities, i.e. traits which are important for the upwardly mobile. This becomes evident when we compare the following figures:

TABLE XX

RESPONSE RATE ON THREE WISHES TEST
(Average number of responses per respondent)

	BV	MS	PH
Average number of responses per respondent (total for all categories)	2.7	3.2	3.1
Average of responses referring to material possessions	2.0	1.5	2.0
Average of responses referring to being famous, being somebody, being brilliant, being successful, being liked, etc.	0.1	0.2	0.4
Average of responses referring to family	0.3	0.7	0.3

It is interesting to note that despite the fact that Prospect Hill respondents score highest on interviewer ratings for 'good family relationships' and 'good communication within the family,' the family itself does not play an outstanding pronounced role for this group in the Three Wishes test. This is precisely in keeping with our general impression, of which more later, that the strength of the Prospect Hill group lies squarely in the fact that though it enjoys relatively good family relationships, it is less 'family centered' then our Market Street respondents.

Despite the fact that numerical responses are small, two items in the category 'educational' are also significant. Prospect Hill respondents are the only group that mentions integrated schools or equal educational opportunities among its Three Wishes--a response in keeping with the fact that throughout the interviews this is the only group that shows an awareness of civil rights problems (though in the spirit of the late Martin Luther King rather then the more militant Black Power philosophy). It is also interesting to note that for the younger and less matter-of-fact Market Street group, a 'good education' or a college career is still something one might wish for on a projective test; while for the older Bayview and Prospect Hill groups, school increasingly becomes a passageway to that more desirable state which they designate as 'being no kid no more.' Hence, despite differences in academic achievement, the per cent of those who wish to be out of school or to be grown up is about equal for these two groups.

A comparison of levels of aspirations of our three lower class groups raises some questions concerning Merton's hypothesis of the relationship between social structure and deviance.(26) Merton's thesis is based on the assumption that lower class youths share the success goals of youths in other social strata and--having less access to legitimate means by which such goals may be achieved--are more likely to pursue them through deviant actions. However, some empirical studies have found that the aspirations of lower class youths are much more restricted then Merton assumes.(27) Data reported here would not only confirm these findings but indicate that the Merton hypothesis may have to be reversed in some instances at least. Of the three lower class groups in our sample, Bayview students which have the highest per cent of 'deviants' also exhibit the lowest level of educational and occupational aspirations. And in fact, this low level of aspiration may well be the result rather then the cause of their deviant behavior: from our informal contacts with this school, it would seem that the responses of our subjects are a fair reflection of what Bayview considers a 'realistic goal' for its charges in terms of both their educational and occupational plans. *Our own argument would be that the young deviant who comes* into contact with the courts, correctional institutions or 'special schools' is more likely to be confronted with 'definitions of the situation' which tend to restrict his level of aspirations then are students in a school such as Market Street which seems neither to encourage nor to inhibit levels of aspiration. Data here strongly indicate that it is meaningless to talk of aspirations of lower class youth in overall terms; that there are many varieties of lower class experiences and life styles; and that, accordingly there are many different levels of aspiration among youths who are often arbitrarily assigned to the same social class position on the basis of such global indicators as parents' occupation, education, income, race or place of residence. In some instances not represented in the present study, the Merton hypothesis may well be valid. Yet the classification scheme to which such a hypothesis could be applied would have to be much more specific then one which merely refers to 'position in the social structure,' as is the case in Merton's anomy theory.

Attitudes Toward School

The previous two sections dealt with respondents' notions concerning education, their plans for the future and their wishes. This section turns to the school itself. The following table is based on responses to the question: "What do you like (or dislike) about your school?" (Responses to a similar question dealing specifically with teachers are presented in the following section.

TABLE XXI

WHAT RESPONDENTS LIKE ABOUT SCHOOL
(Per cent of respondents)

	BV (N 30)	MS (N 30)	PH (N 30)	HT (N 20)
Working Conditions				
Good teachers	23%	17%	10%	55%
Getting more attention then in previous school	27	--	--	65
No girls to detract you	13	--	--	--
Smaller classes then in previous school	17	3	--	45
They make you work here, you get more work done then in previous school	43	7	--	10
Less chance to get into trouble then in previous school	17	--	--	--
Less noise then in previous school	7	--	--	--
Less discipline or easier work then in previous school	10	--	--	5
Like arrangement of class schedules, vocational program, physical plant	--	--	17	--
"They hit you if necessary"	10	--	--	--
Higher academic standards then previous school	--	--	--	--
Interpersonal Relations				
Enjoy social contact with students and faculty	--	27	40	15
"Teachers trust students"	3	--	--	--
Less race prejudice then previous school	7	--	--	--
Enjoy co-educational setting	--	--	--	5
Students are treated like adults	--	--	--	5
One class (i.e. social class) of students	--	--	--	15

(Continued on next page)

TABLE XXI (Continued)

WHAT RESPONDENTS LIKE ABOUT SCHOOL
(Per cent of respondents)

	BV (N 30)	MS (N 30)	PH (N 30)	HT (N 20)
Personal Satisfaction and Enjoyment				
Trips, outings, etc.	20	7	3	5
Something to keep you from getting bored, something to do	--	7	7	50
Enjoy studying or learning new things	--	33	10	--
Find school "fun" or interesting	--	4	3	40

WHAT RESPONDENTS DISLIKE ABOUT SCHOOL
(Per cent of respondents)

Prisonlike atmosphere	40%	13%	--%	--%
Physical plant, inadequate facilities	17	3	--	10
Teaching level too low or do not get courses they want	10	--	--	--
Lack of discipline in class	7	13	53	--
Too strict	10	13	10	--
Having to get up early	13	7	7	--
Lunch or cafeteria	3	3	20	--
Class size (not enough attention)	10	--	--	--
Poor teacher or same teacher all subjects	13	--	--	--
No girls	20	--	--	--
Only one class (i.e. social class) of people	--	--	--	20
Dislike studying, too much work, no fun, long hours	--	27	3	25
Dislike physical punishment	23	--	--	--

Total exceeds 100% because of multiple responses.

In their responses concerning working conditions within the school, both Bayview and High Towers students are for the most part comparing their present school with previously attended regular public schools. The attitude of Bayview youths, reflected in mentions of what they like, clearly parallels the 'single purpose' orientation of the school itself, which might be summed up as: "Do your work and stay out of trouble." Both Bayview and High Towers students are apt to mention that they like the good teachers, the personal attention, the small classes--but High Towers students mention these items twice as often as do Bayview students and are far less likely to emphasize that here they get their work done. As 'single purpose' and highly goal-directed establishments, High Towers would seem to be legitimized in the eyes of its students by the competence of its staff and the individual attention paid to the student (class size is a closely related variable); Bayview, by the fact that here you do your work. The implication of these divergent responses becomes more explicit when we turn to the category "Personal Satisfaction and Enjoyment." For the Bayview student, the only ray of pleasure in an otherwise routinized working week would seem to be occasional trips and outings. In contrast, most High Towers respondents--and one-third of Market Street respondents--find school fun or interesting, something to do, or a place where they enjoy learning new things.

Among Prospect Hill students, the most frequent responses concerning what they like about school refer to contact with teachers and fellow students. This reflects a theme found throughout our analysis of this group, namely its relatively strong interpersonal relations not only inside but also outside the immediate family. Although our middle class respondents also enjoy good interpersonal relationships both inside and outside the school, High Towers is seen above all as a task-oriented environment where competent instruction, something to do, personal attention with regard to the work at hand and the enjoyment of learning are more relevant then the social aspects of the school community. This more 'social' attitude of our Prospect Hill respondents is well summarized in the following observation taken from the interviewer's final report: "School comprises a great segment of their lives, so it is often viewed as a social institution rather than as a primarily academic or educational one. They have fun in school with their friends, with some of their teachers, with extra-curricula activities, etc. In short, school is a social event." At the same time, however, it is evident that our Prospect Hill respondents also realize that the school is a place where work must be done. This is reflected in the fact that under the heading 'dislike about school' their dominant complaint is lack of discipline in the classroom. Here again they show a pattern similar to that we noted with regard to the Three Wishes Test: School is a practical necessity and these youths resent conditions which interfere with their performance of that necessary task. (In contrast to our Bayview sample, however, the Prospect Hill youths do not list the conditions which facilitate this job as one of the aspects they like about their school.)

The same matter-of-fact attitude with regard to the 'job aspect' of the school is reflected in the fact that of all four groups Prospect Hill respondents have the fewest complaints about disciplinary measures or work requirements connected with the school. On that score, the largest number of critical responses (under "dislike about school") comes from the same Bayview group which gave "they make you work, you get your work done" as one of the most important positive aspects of their school. Thus it becomes clear that 'like' and 'dislike' responses must be seen together in order to gauge the extent of the student's ambivalence with regard to certain basic features of the school. For example, 43 per cent of our Bayview respondents comment approvingly that "They help you to get your work done," but 40 per cent complain about the prisonlike atmosphere in which such production schedules are achieved; 17 per cent note approvingly that here they have less chance to get into trouble, but 10 per cent complain that the discipline is too strict. Similarly, 33 per cent of our Market Street respondents give 'studying' and 'learning new things' as one of the pleasurable aspects of the school but 27 per cent complain about having too much work or state that they dislike to study. A similar ambivalence is found in our middle class sample, though the balance is more on the positive side: 40 per cent find school 'fun' or 'interesting,' but 25 per cent dislike the drudgery involved.

In the course of the pretest seminar at which some of the trial tapes for this project were played back, one of the students observed: "These kids talk about school the way a factory worker talks about his job." This spontaneous observation seems equally valid for many of our subsequent interviews; and it is interesting to look at the data presented in the preceding table in terms of the following classification of 'motives for working' from J. A. C. Brown's The Social Psychology of Industry:

> . . . we have suggested that there are three types of motives for working, each related in varying degrees to the work itself:
>
> 1. The work may be done as an end in itself . . .
> 2. It may be carried out willingly for motives other then (1) but directly associated with the work situation . . .
> 3. It may be carried out for genuinely extrinsic reasons . . .
>
> Evidently, (1) is the most satisfactory reason for working, (2) although less satisfactory is a quite adequate motive, and (3) is the least satisfactory.(28)

If we recognize that motives do not operate in isolation but think rather in terms of 'dominant motives' for our four subcultures, then our groups may well be fitted into Brown's scheme:

(a) The dominant motive for our High Towers sample is clearly intrinsic--school is fun, interesting, something to do. The social aspect of the school and school as a place "where they help you to get your work done" has little significance for these students.

(b) Our Prospect Hill respondents clearly fall into Brown's second category. They are twice as likely to mention the social aspects of the school rather than the intrinsic enjoyment of having fun, learning new things or having something to do, and they make no reference to school as a place where "you get your work done."

(c) Our Bayview respondents fall neatly into Brown's third category. They mention neither the social nor the intrinsic rewards of the school, but nearly half of them stress the extrinsic aspects of the educational process, i.e. that you get your work done, stay out of trouble and get your diploma in return.

(d) Our Market Street respondents are a somewhat mixed picture. They place more emphasis on sociability then their middle class counterparts and more on the intrinsic rewards of school attendance then our Prospect Hill sample. However, and despite the fact that on the preceding table they do not score much higher on resentment of discipline then our Prospect Hill sample and not much higher on resentment of school 'chores' then our High Towers group, we shall find in the following section on attitudes toward teachers that acceptance of discipline is one of the problems which differentiate our Market Street respondents from the other two more academically successful groups.

Leaving the Market Street sample aside for the moment as a 'mixed case,' we may note that the Bayview, Prospect Hill and High Towers samples line up in terms of 'work motivation' in a manner parallel to that which Brown designates as the range from 'more' to 'less' satisfactory motives. Furthermore, we may note that the distinction between 'intrinsic' and 'extrinsic' motives for work is, in a way, class related. In The Sociology of Work, Theodore Caplow states:

> We may note in passing that work tends to be regarded as an end in itself precisely in those spheres where it is highly rewarded, and as a painful necessity wherever it is meanly paid. There is nothing very obscure in this situation. Its importance is seen in the scale of differential values which extends from the lower end of the occupational scale, where work offers few psychic rewards and is justified only by the necessity of eating, to certain specialized positions at the upper end, where work is its own sufficient goal . . .(29)

In other words, we may argue that our subjects' responses with regard to school reflect different class related types of attitudes toward work:

(a) Our Bayview respondents are similar to the alienated worker to whom work is an 'extrinsic necessity' offering few if any 'psychic' rewards.

(b) Our Prospect Hill respondents also reflect an essentially lower class work ethic but one in which the harsh realities of 'extrinsic necessities' are mitigated by secondary gains derived from social contact with fellow workers. That such social relationships can produce significant motivations and psychic rewards has been amply demonstrated in the work of Mayo and his followers (starting from the Western Electric studies) and by various studies in the sociology of formal organizations.

(c) Our High Towers sample, in turn, reflects the work ethic of the professional and senior executive groups to which most of their fathers belong. Not only do 40 per cent of our sample find their 'work' fun or interesting, but 50 per cent see is as 'something to do.' While we have noted earlier that this response may in part be a reflection of their age it nevertheless reminds one strongly of the professional or executive trying to develop a hobby against the time when he will be retired and without 'something to do.'

Before concluding comments on this table, we might also note a relationship between these responses and respondents' preferences for different academic subjects. We have noted from the preceding table that Market Street respondents score higher then the other three groups in the response 'liking to learn new things.' As the following table indicates, they did indeed give more positive responses to the question 'what subjects do you like or dislike' then any of the other three groups with one significant exception: English. From the context of our interviews it would appear that this important subject--in contrast to such areas as social studies, science and even 'math'-- does not seem to offer this group the prospect of 'learning new and interesting things.'

TABLE XXII

SUBJECTS LIKED
(Per cent of respondents)

	BV (N 30)	MS (N 30)	PH (N 30)	HT (N 20)
Arithmetic or 'math'	33%	57%	53%	45%
Science	37	50	43	35
English	40	40	47	60
Social Studies	47	53	33	30
Other subjects (music, art, physical education, health education, vocational)	40	60	63	5
English per cent or respondents who like subjects minus those who do not	20	20	35	55

Total exceeds 100 per cent because of multiple responses.

While the foregoing data refer to the school situation as the student actually experiences it, we also included in our interviews a 'projective' question phrased as follows: "If you were the principal of this school (or if you were to build your own school) and you could do anything you wanted, what would you do or what changes would you make?" (Market Street responses were too few to be included in the following table.)

Some of the items in the following table are clearly a reflection of the youths 'dislikes' concerning their own schools, such as the physical plant and the sex and age composition of the student body on the part of Bayview respondents; references to lunch room facilities and schedules on the part of the Prospect Hill sample, etc. However, we find the table significant because of what it reveals about our middle class sample. This group offered the fewest critical responses on direct questions concerning their 'dislikes' about school, yet they gave twice as many responses as either of the two lower class groups when asked to describe their 'ideal' school. Here again it is interesting to note that the responses of our middle class subjects in many ways fit 'the book'--in this case a book on a progressive educational institution (Summerhill) which was widely read around the time these interviews were conducted and which was indeed referred to by name by three of our twenty High Towers subjects.

TABLE XXIII

IF THEY COULD CHANGE THE SCHOOL
(Per cent of respondents)

	BV (N 30)	PH (N 30)	HT (N 20)
Working Conditions			
Change physical plant and teaching materials	80%	30%	20%
Change hours or calendar	7	23	30
Change lunch and lunchroom or lunch schedule	7	43	--
Have small classes or adequate student-teacher ratio	37	17	100
Provide adequate transportation	--	3	5
Have school uniforms	--	3	15
Curriculum, Faculty and Student Body			
Good (or better) faculty and administrative staff	23	37	100
Changes in curriculum (or references to curriculum)	17	40	65
References to sex and age composition of student body	27	13	15
Integrated school	7	--	15
Separate instruction for good and poor students	--	3	15
Student-Teacher Relationships			
Strict or fairly strict discipline	10	13	45
No strict discipline	17	10	70
No physical punishment	17	--	5
Give students part in decision making	--	3	15
Respect and understanding between students and teachers	--	--	50
Creative atmosphere, freedom of speech, teach students to think for themselves	--	--	15
Other	3	3	15

Totals exceed 100 per cent because of multiple responses.

Bayview. As noted earlier, Bayview students' responses under 'likes' about school mainly reflect their appreciation of the mechanisms by which one gets one's work done and avoids trouble;

at the same time, their dislikes reflect a strong sense of ambivalence with regard to the necessary discipline. On the 'projective' question, however, the physical nature of the plant, class size and the composition of the student body take precedence over references to discipline. While 40 per cent of the respondents in this group complain about the 'prisonlike' atmosphere of the school, 23 per cent about physical punishment and 10 per cent about too much discipline; only 17 per cent mention that if they had their way they would abolish physical punishment, and only 17 per cent suggest that they would have less strict discipline. In other words, it would seem that Bayview students, however ambivalent they may be with respect to the discipline they encounter in their school, consider this an inevitable part of the setting in which one is 'made to work.' The three things which more then one-fourth of Bayview respondents would like to see changed are only indirectly related to the question of discipline: the physical plant; class size (which is not so much a change as a confirmation of one of the characteristics which differentiates Bayview from other public schools); and the composition of the student body which refers to a mixture of desiderata such as having girls, not having girls, or not having 'those little kids' in the lower grades.

Prospect Hill. Comparing the stable lower class group with Bayview respondents, we find fewer differences on the 'projective' then on the 'like' and 'dislike' tables. In the latter case, we found that the Prospect Hill sample's main positive experience in the school was its social aspect; their main criticism, a lack of classroom discipline. But here again the concern with discipline in the 'real' situation is not reflected in the projection of what these students would do if they were principal. Rather, the main emphasis is distributed fairly evenly among 'working conditions,' i.e. the physical plant and the lunchroom situation, and the nature of faculty and curriculum. And it is in regard to these two latter items, on which the Prospect Hill sample stands clearly midway between our unstable lower class and our middle class group, that a certain 'value stretch' is again noticable. Teachers, administrators and the curriculum are, in a sense, more directly and relevantly related to the adequacy of the educational enterprise then are buildings, luncheons or even class size. However, it is interesting to note that while for our middle class group faculty and administration are a more important factor in their 'ideal' school then is curriculum, this is not the case for the Prospect Hill sample--despite the fact that for these youths the latter, 'human,' aspect of the school is a much more important factor in their 'likes' about school. The explanation of this difference lies, we think, in the fact that responses tabulated under 'good (or better) faculty and administrative staff' in the answers to our projective question refer to competence rather than personal relationships. When it comes to 'liking' school, our stable lower class respondents are more 'person' oriented then any of the three other groups; but when it comes to 'improving' the school, the lower class student is as likely to see this as a problem of 'subjects' as that of 'people.' On the other hand, the middle class student, though as 'person' oriented, nevertheless places the emphasis first and foremost on the competence of his teachers and of the administrative staff.

High Towers. On the 'like' and 'dislike' questions, the High Towers sample made very little reference to the question of discipline, much less then did the three lower class groups. Thus it is doubly noteworthy that it should be this group which places so much more emphasis on the question of discipline (both in the direction of more and of less strict) in describing their 'ideal' school. The difference here, as with regard to other items on the 'projective' table on which our middle class respondents score high, seems to us to reflect the fact that--in contrast to the lower class samples--this group has an educational 'ideology,' i.e. an idea of what a good education should be, which our lower class subjects totally lack. Though most High Towers respondents express a very positive attitude toward their own school (quite a number said their ideal school would be 'pretty much like High Towers'), it must be remembered that it is precisely from this, rather than from the lower class, that the rebellious students of Berkely, Columbia and other first rate universities have come. (The Black student revolt on the campus has a different origin.) If we go down the table of responses regarding the 'ideal school,' we see that most of the items scored high by our middle class sample are strikingly similar to demands of university students in revolt: smaller classes; better faculty and administrative staff; changes in the curriculum; less formal discipline; more respect and understanding between students and teachers; a more creative atmosphere and freedom of expression, etc. It is only in the fact that nearly one-half of our middle class group would have fairly strict discipline in their 'ideal school' that they differ from the present campus rebels, a difference which is probably due both to the age of our respondents and to the fact that High Towers seems to have succeeded in instilling in its students a healthy respect for discipline without, however, pulling the reigns so tight as to make them resentful.

In concluding this section, a note must be added concerning its implications for the relationship between our four subcultures and what it has to say in terms of the original focus of this research, the 'conflict of subcultures' hypothesis.

As indicated earlier, both the Bayview and the Prospect Hill groups clearly reflect a lower class 'work ethic': a job, or for that matter an education, is a necessary chore which has little intrinsic pleasure to offer (though for our Prospect Hill group the drudgery is significantly offset by secondary benefits in terms of the sociability encountered in the school environment). We believe that the difference between these two groups is partly a reflection of the differences in interpersonal relations we find evidenced throughout the interviews. However, an additional factor may be that Bayview has a large number of relatively recent transfer students who are new to this particular school. In addition, Bayview students at the time these interviews were conducted were less likely to live in the same area then were students in the regular public schools. The effects of these particular characteristics of Bayview are reflected in responses to the question: "Where do you make most of your friends--in school, in the neighborhood or both?" Bayview students were more likely then were Prospect Hill students to report that they made friends in their neighborhood rather than in the school.

In regard to our Market Street respondents, the overall impression is that more then any other of the three lower class groups these would like to see school as 'fun,' but are also aware and resentful of the fact that it is not. As we have seen in different contexts (i.e. 'purpose of education' and the Three Wishes Test) this younger group is still somewhat less oriented to 'extrinsic necessities' such as jobs and material possessions, more deeply involved in authority relationships. Perhaps the best way to characterize these young people is that they have not yet developed a clearly articulated 'work ethic' with regard to the school, and at this point we are unable to predict into which of Brown's three categories of 'motivation for work' they will eventually fall. There is still yet another possibility which, given the age differences between our respondents, we cannot test. It is possible that given an unstable lower class group such as our Market Street respondents and given a 'multipurpose' school such as Market Street with its very tangential influence on its students, these youths will never develop the clear pattern of work motivation evidenced by our other three groups.

Turning to the relevance of the data presented in this section for the question on which this research was based, we would offer the hypothesis that it is not the lower class but the middle class child who is likely to experience a conflict of subcultures between home and school. It is the middle class sample that has the most clearly articulated ideas as to what a school should be, and while many of these ideas may reflect the reality of High Towers, we have also noted the similarity of their responses to an educational ideology which, at the time of our interviews, was quite popular in the progressive intellectual circles to which many of their parents belong. If these youngsters were sent to Bayview, they would be the one's to experience a severe 'culture shock.'

We have noted earlier that the educational ideology presented by our middle class respondents closely parallels that reflected in the current rebellion on many college campuses. Middle class youths clearly seem to experience a 'conflict of subcultures' between the 'private sphere' of their home environment and the world of the 'multiversity.' On the other hand, the current struggle over community control of black ghetto schools in New York City reflect a 'conflict of subcultures' different from that on which our original research was based. As we have stressed throughout the preceding sections, for our lower class subjects education means a preparation for the world of work, and school is first and foremost the place where that preparation must take place, 'extrinsic' or painful as it may be. It is not a conflict over the desirability of this goal for the lower class student but over the failure of the school to actually achieve it, that parents and teachers confront each other as antagonistic 'subcultures' on such topic as the decentralization of the New York public school system.

Attitudes Toward Teachers

The previous section reviewed the attitudes of subjects concerning the school as an educational institution or process. This section deals with answers to such questions as: "What do you like and dislike about your teachers?," "What makes a good or bad teacher?," etc. And here we have an indication of the extent to which the perception of an institution on the part of subjects is congruent with the attitude toward the people who are its living representatives.

A comparison of total number of responses shows that all four groups find it easier to express their likes and dislikes concerning their teachers then those concerning the more abstract school. Characteristically, the only exception is the response of our middle class group to the question concerning their 'ideal' school.

As the following table indicates--and despite consistent differences in the language patterns of interviews--one must be careful in speaking of one group of respondents being 'more articulate' then another. In fact, the different number of responses given by the different groups for different questions would seem to depend very much on the nature of the questions themselves; and our own suggestion would be that differences in response rates are dependent upon 'experiential factors' no less then upon cognitive style. For example, the Bayview group which by any index of cognitive style is far less articulate then the middle class control group nevertheless gives far more responses concerning dislikes of their school and teachers--possibly, we would venture, because they have more to dislike. The fact that Bayview students, for instance, refer more often then do High Towers students to the need for changes in physical plant would seem to reflect not differences in cognitive and linguistic style so much as the very real and material differences between the school buildings in which the two groups are taught.

TABLE XXIV

TOTAL NUMBER OF RESPONSES TO SCHOOL RELATED QUESTIONS

	BV	MS	PH	HT*
	(30 subjects in each group)			
What they like about school	59	35	27	97
What they dislike about school	43	24	28	16
Academic subjects they like	61	94	80	66
Academic subjects they do not like	31	36	35	36
If they could change the school	75	--	73	219
Purpose of education	48	65	70	92
What they like about teachers	56	94	93	120
What they dislike about teachers	51	131	94	18

* Projected to 30 subjects on the basis of 20 actual interviews.

Indeed, it is only with regard to the most abstract item in this table, i.e. the question on the purpose of education, that response rates run consistently in the direction we would expect from our knowledge of the academic performance of our subjects and their command of the language. (We do not at this stage plan to undertake a linguistic analysis of tapes, but the foregoing would seem to support the contention of those who claim that tests involving verbal performance are never quite 'culture free' and that performance on them is related not only to class-linked patterns of speech but also to differences with regard to significance of topics to the respondents.)

In view of these considerations, we would hesitate to put too much weight on a comparison of response rates of the four groups of youths. We would, however, like to note some of the differences in response rates on different subjects within each group.

That our middle class subjects should offer many more positive then negative comments about the school and its staff is hardly surprising. What seems somewhat odd, however, is the fact that the reverse is not the case for our Bayview group, the one most hostile to the educational process. As we shall attempt to show later, this tendency to give more positive then negative responses to all 'like-dislike' questions holds true for this group with regard also to people in general but is reversed in one notable case--their likes and dislikes concerning their parents. Since this group was interviewed under the same conditions as the Market Street sample, and since the latter shows a very different pattern, we doubt that the inhibition of negative responses was solely due to the interviewing situation as such.

Among Market Street respondents, the high ratio of negative responses concerning their teachers would seem to reflect the degree to which this younger group is still bound up in a love-hate relationship with authority.

The most balanced picture is presented by our stable lower class Baltimore group which gives a practically even number of positive and negative responses with regard to the school as well as to their teachers. This is doubly noteworthy in view of the fact that this group seems to have much more personal contact with their teachers then the lower class New York samples, is more likely to discuss its occupational and educational plans with them, and reports more favorable and fewer unfavorable comments from their teachers then the other two lower class groups. Furthermore, our Prospect Hill sample seems not only to have a fairly balanced 'like-dislike' attitude toward its teachers but, in contrast to Bayview respondents, is fairly realistic about the reciprocity of such relationships. Of fifteen respondents in our Bayview sample who answered the question: "Do you think teachers like teaching?" 87 per cent said yes; 2 per cent said no; and 11 per cent were uncertain. Of nineteen Prospect Hill subjects who answered the same question 58 per cent said yes; and 42 per cent said no. Most of our Bayview students explained their answers by such comments as: "Well, he stands up there, doesn't he?," whereas Prospect Hill respondents were more likely to refer to specific actions or facial expressions of their teachers or to the behavior of students which may or may not make a teacher's task rewarding.

This difference in the perception of the teacher as a person rather than the embodiment of a social role is also reflected in the following responses to the question: "Does liking a teacher make a difference in how well you like a subject or how well you do in it?"

From subjects' responses to questions concerning their likes and dislikes with regard to specific academic subjects, it would seem that, in reality, liking a teacher and liking the subject he teaches is more closely correlated for our Bayview group then for our High Towers subjects. Yet here again the subject's 'definition of the situation' is significant even if it is not born out by the evidence. In a study of white and Negro high school youths, David Gottlieb found that "The higher the class background the greater the belief that the teacher is aware of and understands the goal of the students."(30) Our general impression, derived from a comparison of our four subcultures, is that this proposition can also be stated as follows: The higher the class background, the more likely the student is to be aware of and relate to the teacher as a person rather than as the faceless performer of an official role. We would suspect that such differences in basic student-teacher relationships may be as much or even more significant for the students academic career then his abstract ideas concerning 'education' or 'the school.'

TABLE XXV

LIKING A TEACHER MAKES A DIFFERENCE IN HOW WELL ONE WORKS
(Per cent of respondents)

	BV (N 18)	PH (N 18)	HT (N 20)
It makes a difference	17%	72%	65%
It makes no difference	66	28	15
Depends on circumstances	17	--	20
	100%	100%	100%

After these preliminary remarks, we now turn to findings regarding our respondents' specific likes and dislikes concerning their teachers.

For all four groups of youths, the most important factor in the judgment of the teacher is his personal relationship to the student, and especially his personal concern and helpfulness. However, our stable lower class group is somewhat more likely to give critical comments regarding the teacher-student relationship. While none of the four groups expresses a liking for strict teachers, the Bayview sample is more vocal in its negative resentment of a strict disciplinarian then in its positive evaluation of a more lenient teacher; our Market Street sample places equal emphasis on disliking a strict and liking a lenient teacher; and our Prospect Hill sample seems somewhat more inclined to opt for the teacher who is 'fun' then to express resentment of those who are too strict. Our middle class sample, on the other hand, expresses little concern with the disciplinary aspects of the teacher-student relationship and, much more then any of the three lower class groups, emphasizes personality and competence. We believe that the following restatement of three salient features indicated in the below table brings out what we feel to be the significant differences between our four groups.

TABLE XXVI

WHAT RESPONDENTS LIKE ABOUT THEIR TEACHERS
(Per cent of responses)

	BV (N 56)	MS (N 94)	PH (N 93)	HT (N 80)
Discipline				
Is strict, makes you work	10%	3%	9%	2%
Is not too strict, not too much work	6	13	6	4
Is fun, kids around	7	9	16	1
Does not yell or hit	9	11	1	--
Gives extra time for reports	--	3	--	--
	32%	39%	32%	7%
Personal Qualities (personality, appearance, etc.)	--	2%	2%	11%
Relationship to Students				
Cares, is concerned, nice, helpful, etc.	27%	24%	27%	26%
Fair treatment, gives you second chance	10	9	6	6
Has respect for students, does not embarrass them	6	2	4	3
Takes time to talk to students	3	5	2	--
Discusses students personal problems	2	2	8	--
If you're nice to them they are nice to you	2	5	--	--
Gives students a chance to express themselves in class	--	--	2	7
	50%	47%	49%	42%
Competence (competent, stimulating, explains well, dedicated, tries to teach you)	18%	12%	17%	40%
	100%	100%	100%	100%

WHAT RESPONDENTS DISLIKE ABOUT THEIR TEACHERS
(Per cent of responses)

	BV (N 51)	MS (N 131)	PH (N 96)	HT (N 12)
Discipline				
Hits, yells, too strict	37%	26%	18%	--%
Works you too hard	--	9	1	--
Does not keep discipline in class	--	5	4	--
	37%	40%	23%	--%

(Continued on next page)

TABLE XXVI (Continued)

WHAT RESPONDENTS DISLIKE ABOUT THEIR TEACHERS
(Per cent of responses)

	BV (N 51)	MS (N 131)	PH (N 96)	HT (N 12)
Relationship to Students				
Not interested, mean, fussy	26%	12%	16%	--%
Unfair, picks on students, does not trust them	18	23	27	--
Does not admit if he is wrong	--	1	1	17
Makes fun of or does not respect students	--	5	5	--
Not concerned with students' future	--	--	1	--
No chance to express views in class, not enough encouragement	--	--	2	17
	44%	41%	52%	34%
Personal Qualities (show off, poor dresser, etc.)	4%	2%	6%	--%
Competence (incompetent, teaches nothing, acts bored, etc.)	15%	17%	19%	66%
	100%	100%	100%	100%

SUMMARY: LIKES AND DISLIKES ABOUT TEACHERS
(Per cent of responses)

	BV	MS	PH	HT
Strict Discipline				
Likes strict discipline	10%	3%	9%	2%
Dislikes strict discipline	37	35	19	--
Easy Going, Fun, Less Discipline				
Likes less discipline	22%	36%	23%	5%
Dislikes lack of discipline	--	5	4	--
Relationship to Students				
Positive comments	50%	47%	49%	42%
Negative comments	44	41	52	34
Personal Qualities				
Positive comments	--%	2%	2%	11%
Negative comments	4	2	6	--
Competence				
Likes competent teacher	18%	12%	17%	40%
Dislikes incompetent teacher	15	17	19	66

While we shall combine positive and negative responses from different tables which, in a sense, are non-additive, we shall do so in order to compare not so much the specific features of their teachers that our students like but those characteristics referred to most frequently.

TABLE XXVII

SUMMARY: TEACHERS' CHARACTERISTICS
(Per cent of responses)

	BV	MS	PH	HT
References to Discipline (all categories)	69%	79%	55%	7%
References to Personal Qualities or Competence (all categories)	37%	33%	44%	100%

The above table suggests the correlation between social class and 'social competence' to which we shall return in greater detail later. The latter requires a maximum of self direction, i.e. a minimum of concern with 'controls from without' and a maximum of 'de-centering.' In other words, the ability to relate to other persons and situations in terms of their intrinsic or universalistic nature and qualities rather than in terms of their particularistic or immediate subjective meaning for the actor. Our Market Street sample is the one still most closely involved with the authority role of the teacher and least aware of their own personal qualities and competence. On the other hand, our Prospect Hill sample, while not too different from our two lower class New York groups, seems to have moved somewhat in the direction indicated by what may be a 'polar case' represented by our middle class sample: toward deemphasis of authority relationships and emphasis on personal qualities and competence.

The different degrees of emphasis on the 'faceless authority' of the teacher found in the foregoing is also reflected in answers to the question: "What do you think your teachers expect of you?" (Also phrased as "What do they want you to do?," "What do they bug you about?," etc.)

TABLE XXVIII

WHAT DOES THE TEACHER EXPECT OF THE STUDENT
(Per cent of respondents)

	BV	MS	PH
	(N 30 for each)		
Attend classes, go to school, get an education, get your diploma, etc.	40%	8%	10%
Behave in class, obey teacher, don't get into trouble, etc.	97	63	70
Study, do your work, learn, etc.	43	33	53
Dress neatly, don't chew gum, have good manners	3	4	20
Set example for younger students	3	--	--
Take care of school property	--	4	--
Cry when you get into trouble	--	4	--
Good motivation or good work (in contrast to just 'work' or 'study' above)	--	16	43
Behave like a 'normal' kid	--	4	7
Teachers expect too much	--	--	13
Teachers are concerned about students' future	--	--	7
Be cooperative, sociable or reasonable	--	4	13

Totals exceed 100 per cent because of multiple responses.

SUMMARY OF TEACHERS EXPECTATIONS AS SEEN BY STUDENTS
(Per cent of responses)

	BV (N 57)	MS (N 40)	PH (N 70)
Attend classes, get education, get diploma, etc.	21%	5%	4%
Behave, obey, don't get into trouble, etc.	52	47	30
Study, do your work, learn, etc.	22	25	23
Other responses	5	23	43
	100%	100%	100%

Taking the two tables in combination, we again find evidence of the similarity between basic attitudes of our stable and unstable lower class subcultures and the 'value stretch' of the former. Taking the first three categories on our two tables ('attend, behave and study') as the stereotyped expectation attributed to a more or less faceless educational functionary, we find that these responses make up nearly the whole view of the teachers' expectations for our

2

Bayview group, 77 per cent of all responses for our Market Street group but only 57 per cent of all responses for our Prospect Hill sample. That despite this significant difference the response of the last group still reflects a basically lower class percention of the teacher may be seen in the contrast with our middle class sample whose response to this question was generally 'Get into college' or, more often, 'get into a good college.' The terms used in the first three 'stereotyped' categories in the foregoing tables were not employed by the middle class respondents. Just as in rating the teacher the middle class respondent placed major emphasis on personal qualities and performance rather than on discipline, so he expects to be judged not in terms of conforming or obedient behavior but in terms of the adequacy of his own performance as measured by the goal of his 'single purpose' school.

Comparing Bayview with Prospect Hiss subjects we find that the differences between the two groups reflect both the 'value stretch' noted earlier and the greater tendency of Prospect Hill youths to relate to the teacher as an individual (and to expect the teacher to relate to them in the same fashion), also found earlier. Our Prospect Hill sample is more likely then either of the two other lower class groups to give responses other then those in the 'stereotyped' categories--and among these, the most important is again a response related to performance: to show good motivation or to do good work.

As to our Market Street sample, its lower response rate in the 'stereotyped' categories must be seen in the context of the fact that this group has the lowest response rate of the three groups on the foregoing tables. Hence, for a comparison of our subcultures the summary given in terms of per cent of responses must also be taken into account. This summary indicates that in terms of relative significance which the different items have for our three groups, the item 'Attend, get an education, get your diploma' seems clearly to reflect the 'special purpose' of Bayview; stereotyped references to performance (i.e. 'Study, do your work, etc.) are ranked nearly equally by all three groups; but the items 'Behave, obey, etc.' and 'Other responses' run in opposite directions, indicating a decreasing emphasis on authority and an increasing reference to more individualized perceptions of the teacher as we move from our most alienated to our stable lower class group.

Our findings in this section confirm what we noted earlier with regard to our subjects' attitude toward the school. Though for all of our lower class youths the purpose of education is essentially pragmatic, i.e. a necessary preamble to the job market, the groups vary significantly in their reaction to the school and its personnel. Just as for our Bayview sample attending school is essentially a task which has only 'extrinsic' rewards, if any; so the teacher is seen primarily as a disciplinarian who, hopefully, will relate to his student with understanding and concern, but whose expectations are defined in a fairly stereotyped way with major emphasis placed on obedience. For our Prospect Hill sample, on the other hand, the school does have its 'secondary' rewards in the form of sociability; and the teacher is less likely to be judged in terms of his status as a disciplinarian, somewhat more likely to be seen in terms of his personal qualities and competence, and more likely to be viewed as relating to the student in a less stereotyped manner, putting less emphasis on the student's obedience and more emphasis on the quality of his performance. Our Market Street sample, on the other hand, is more likely to stress the enjoyment of 'learning new things,' i.e. the intrinsic rewards of the educational process; but at the same time, in its perception of the teacher it shows a great deal of resentment of his authority role and evidences less ability then the other two groups to think of the teacher not simply as an authority figure but as someone who has certain expectations with regard to the student. In short, this group seems to have the least 'integrated' view of the educational process as reflected in their inability to accept that while learning new things can be 'fun,' the educational process also requires a certain amount of discipline. (This tendency to compartmentalize responses--which is characteristic for many respondents in our Market Street sample--has been discussed at some length in our interim report.) The comparison of perception of teachers' expectations as it varies between the three lower class groups in our sample points to an important factor in school adjustment and 'social competence' in general which, we believe, has not been given sufficient emphasis in the educational literature.

In the study of the 'disadvantaged learner' much attention has been paid to problems of 'deprivation' in terms of range of information, linguistic patterns and cognitive styles directly relevant to academic achievement. Although it has been generally stressed that these factors are related to the social experience of the lower class child, there seems to be a tendency to reduce these experiences to categories which are amenable to the development of testing instruments. We would agree that many of the categories derived in this fashion are relevant and probably valid. Yet we feel that in the process of reduction the full significance of differences in social experience tends to get lost. School is, among other things, a social situation, and the ability to respond successfully (in the sense of attaining whatever goal one wishes to achieve in a particular social interaction) is to a large extent a function of the skills and expectations one brings to that situation on the basis of past experience. However, the experiential component which thus becomes a significant factor in any interpersonal situation, including the school setting, cannot be reduced to 'information' and 'cognitive styles' in which these variables are measured in terms of IQ tests or tests based on academic requirements and skills. Our data would seem to indicate that an additional factor is the ability 'to take the role of the other,' that is, to take into account the particular qualities and expectations of the people with whom one interacts. In Development of Role-Taking and Communications Skills in Children, John H. Flawell points to the relationship between the ability 'to take the role of the other' and the ability to communicate successfully.(31) While Flawell's work did not touch upon the class factor, we believe that the same experiments conducted by him and his associates would show similar differences in role taking ability when performed with subjects from different social strata. We suspect that such a study would produce a picture similar to that discussed by Lerner in his comparison of traditional and modern societies: the more 'modern' or 'middle class' groups would tend to show a higher ability for 'empathy,' a term which is defined by Webster as "Imaginative projection of one's own consciousness into another being" or, in the language of role theory, the prerequisit for 'taking the role of the other.'

Our data on student's perceptions of teacher's expectations indicate that the stable lower class subjects are more likely to see the teacher as an individual rather than a stereotyped funcfionary. In the following sections of this report, we shall show how this greater ability to see people as individuals and, therefore, more adequately 'take their role' has its roots in the experiences which the student brings to the school setting.

Parents' Attitude Toward Education

In one respect, responses of subjects would almost seem to reverse the basic idea behind the 'conflict of subcultures hypothesis.' One-half of our middle class sample state that there is 'not much' pressure from parents with regard to academic achievement, and twelve out of twenty feel that there is more pressure put on them by the school then by their parents. But such responses must not be misunderstood. In some instances, the competitive spirit of the school is enough to keep the student working at top capacity (one of the best students in our sample reports that 'We don't talk much about school') and others clearly indicate that they are aware of the indirect and manipulative ways in which some parents may convey their desires to their children ("They don't pressure me, but they say it would be nice . . .," etc.). Most of our lower class respondents, on the other hand, report that parents place great emphasis, if not on school achievement, then at least on attendance and obedience. For example, two lower class respondents quoted their mothers as saying that "If you fail in school I'm going to throw you out of the house"; in contrast, one of our middle class subjects remarked of her parents: "They would like me to get into a good college, but if I don't make it they won't throw me out." In short, as far as the importance of school attendance is concerned, our lower class subjects are clearly not exposed to a conflict of subcultures.

Interviews also indicate that most of the parents of our subjects are aware of the importance of homework and make some attempt to check whether or not it is being done. In fact, some of our subjects report that on days when they have no homework or come home without books they are 'nagged' by their parents to the point that they pretend to do some work even if none has been assigned. When asked who helped them with their homework or checked to see if they had done it, subjects responded as follows:

TABLE XXIX

WHO HELPS WITH HOMEWORK
(Per cent of respondents)

	BV (N 30)	MS (N 30)	PH (N 30)	HT (N 20)
Father	23%	13%	10%	20%
Mother	--	37	23	20
Either parent	30	13	--	35
Siblings	37	13	13	25
Teachers and other school personnel	20	3	20	40
Others	--	--	10	10

Of course, the meaning of the term 'helping' in this context is rather flexible and may range from a scientist who helps his son with his algebra to a semi-literate mother who may only look at the student's notebook and has little ability to correct his mistakes. Also, in many cases we have included references by our middle class sample to the fact that they could get help if they asked for it, even if, they added, they seldom did. However, the above table is presented to indicate that whatever makes the difference between the academic performance of the Prospect Hill and the two lower-class New York samples it would not seem to be a greater degree of interest in or supervision of their homework on the part of parents or older siblings.

There would, on the other hand, seem to be varying degrees of the participation of parents in school affairs. The following table summarizes subjects' responses to the question: "Do your parents ever come to school? On what occasion?"

TABLE XXX

PARENTS VISITING SCHOOL
(Per cent of respondents)

	BV	MS	PH
	(N 30 for all groups)		
Parents attending PTA meetings	3%	3%	43%
Visit during open school week, called in for misdemeanor of student or to see teachers on other occasions	50	44	27

This table clearly shows one difference between our stable and unstable lower class samples and one which we shall also see reflected in the leisure time activities of their children. Parents of Prospect Hill respondents are more likely to participate in voluntary school activities while lower class New York parents are likely to come to school only to discuss the progress or problems of their child. How much participation in PTA activities seems to be taken for granted by many of our Prospect Hill respondents is reflected in the response of one who, when asked to describe his mother, replied: "Well, she is kind of average. Goes to PTA meetings and all that.".

While nearly all of our respondents say that their families consider education 'important,' there were some differences when we asked just what their parents had said in this connection. The following table summarizes the responses of the lower class groups. (Here again, as with expectations of teachers, the responses of the middle class control group do not fit into most of the lower class categories.)

TABLE XXXI

WHAT PARENTS SAY ABOUT EDUCATION
(Per cent of respondents)

	BV	MS	PH
	(N 30 for all groups)		
Get a good education, stay in school, finish school, attend classes	70%	43%	50%
Behave, obey your teacher, don't get into trouble	17	30	3
Study, read, do your work, do well	20	23	17
Refer to importance of education in connection with getting a job	10	27	30
Refer to importance of education in connection with raising a family	3	3	7
Threaten to punish subject if he does not go to school	10	7	7
Refer to fact that they themselves 'did not have the chance'	--	10	13
Seldom talk about education	27	3	3
Warn subject that if he flunks out he will be 'bum,' turn bad or be like some relative who also dropped out	6	17	3

Totals exceed 100 per cent because of multiple responses.

The first three items on this table are the same noted under 'teachers' expectations' as being more or less stereotyped responses. However, we find that while all three lower class groups tend to mention 'Go to school, get an education, etc.' more often as an expectation of parents than of teachers, all three mention teachers more often than parents with regard to the other two stereotyped responses, i.e. 'Obey, behave, etc.' and 'Learn, study, do your work,' etc. Nevertheless, when we consider the relative weight of these stereotyped responses in the total picture, we find that the youths' responses concerning parental and teachers' expectations run in a similar direction.

TABLE XXXII

PARENTAL VS. TEACHERS' EXPECTATIONS
(Per cent of responses)

	BV	MS	PH
	(N 30 for each group)		
'Stereotyped Responses' (attend, obey, work, etc.)			
Parents' expectations	64%	57%	49%
Teachers' expectations	95	77	57
Other Responses			
Parents' expectations	36%	43%	51%
Teachers' expectations	5	23	43
'Stereotyped Responses'			
Teachers' minus parents' expectations	31%	20%	8%

The foregoing table suggests that the tendency to 'stereotype' parental and teachers' expectations declines simultaneously, indicating that it is function of differences in general 'role taking' ability rather than a tendency related to the specific topic under review. Furthermore, we note that while the Bayview and Market Street groups give a higher percentage of 'stereotyped' responses with regard to the teacher rather than the parent, our Prospect Hill sample with its greater 'role taking' ability tends to give such responses in about equal measure for both groups. Finally we note that since expectations of parents and teachers are largely seen in terms of the same categories, there is little room for a 'conflict of subcultures.' Nor does a comparison of 'other responses' on the tables for parents' and teachers' expectations respectively appear to give any indication of a perception of conflicting demands or expectations.

Earlier, we noted that when asked about their teachers' expectations, our Prospect Hill sample gave the largest number of responses while our Market Street group had the greatest difficulty with this question. However, when we asked later in the interview what their parents 'nag them about' (a phrase which seemed more meaningful to many of our subjects than the more abstract 'expect of them') we found that it was our Market Street sample with its strong attachment to parental authority that gave the greatest number of responses (a total of 112); our Bayview sample gave 39 responses; and our Prospect Hill sample (the one relatively most 'de-centered' from the family) gave only 23 responses. The following summary shows trends which confirm some of our previous observations:

TABLE XXXIII

WHY PARENTS 'NAG'
(Per cent of respondents)

	BV (N 26)	MS (N 24)	PH (N 17)
Matters related to the school	42%	100%	36%
Behave, don't get into trouble	81	100	47
Make something of yourself, don't be a 'bum'	12	54	18
Others (be home on time, take care of siblings, etc.)	16	33	36

Totals exceed 100 per cent because of multiple responses.

Here again a comparison of Bayview and Prospect Hill responses shows a similar difference in relative emphasis on 'standard' vs. more 'individualized' items. Bayview youths report more admonitions than do Prospect Hill youths to 'Stay, behave or do well in school,' fewer references to 'Making something of yourself' and items such as being home on time or taking care of siblings.

Once again, also, Market Street youths come out a mixed lot. They report more 'nagging' with regard to school and behavior than do Prospect Hill youths, but they also report more 'nagging' with regard to 'Making something of yourself and not being a bum.'

Interestingly, respondents' reports on the causes of 'nagging' do not quite jibe with their reports on the causes of punishment. When asked what they get punished for, 63 per cent of the Market Street sample, 59 per cent of the Bayview sample, and 58 per cent of the Prospect Hill sample mention matters related to school. Thus, subjects are much more similar in the number reporting being punished for school-related misbehavior than they would seem when we compare the relative frequency with which they report being 'nagged' on the subject.

Although we did not press our subjects on either of these questions and hence would not place too much weight on a quantitative comparison of these responses, implicit in the responses and the interviews themselves is a suggestion touched upon earlier in this report. As indicated in the beginning of this section, it would appear highly doubtful that a 'content analysis' of what parents actually say to their children tells the whole story. We must, rather, take into account the fact that respondents receive such communications within the overall context of a long-standing relationship. Thus, the middle class subject who reports, "My parents don't pressure me about school," knows very well that his parents attach great importance to school achievements or to the occupational status for which such achievements are prerequisites; and--as spelled out specifically by some of our High Towers respondents--while parents may not 'pressure' but only 'suggest' ("It would be nice, darling, if . . ."), to the well socialized middle class child the intent of the 'suggestion' is abundantly clear.

By the same contextual token, lower class New York subjects would seem to view parental admonitions as a kind of routine--the sort of thing harrassed parents say while clearing the table or turning temporarily from the television set; a communication, in short, that has little real significance for the youth to whom it is addressed.

But here again, this would not seem to mean that our lower class New York subjects are confronted with a 'conflict of subcultures.' On the contrary, there is the distinct impression that many tend to react to the admonitions 'Stay in school,' 'Get an education,' 'Do your work,' etc. in the same way whether it comes from parents or teachers.

Family Relationships

In the previous sections, we stressed that the school must be seen as an interpersonal situation to which the student brings a set of expectations and habitual responses derived from his experience outside the school setting. Hence the question arises: To what extent does the student's perception of his teacher parallel his perception of the first 'significant others' he has encountered in his young life, that is to say, his parents? Two items in our interviews were specifically designed to explore this question: 'What kinds of people are your parents?' and 'What do you like and dislike about them?' While many of our subjects had trouble with the first item, such responses as they gave indicated for the most part a positive appraisal of their parents--"They are nice," "They are alright," "They care about me," etc. However, a review of the interviews as a whole often reveals a different story. In many instances, communication between youths and parents seems poor, superficial and limited to routine admonitions. What the subject indicates as a 'close' relationship to a parent--usually the mother --often turns out to be a relationship of domination and control rather than one of interaction. Few of our lower class subjects are as perceptive as the Bayview student who observed that his mother did not like him because "She don't like men" and indicated that he sympathized with her, "Seeing what my father was like."

In the beginning, we tended to write off stereotyped references to 'nice' parents as an 'expected answer.' However, it is interesting to note that a mental health study conducted in midtown Manhattan and which interviewed adults only, found a similar tendency for lower class subjects to report having had fewer teenage disagreements with their parents than did subjects in higher socioeconomic strata.(32) The report on this study notes that "these data are in apparent contradiction to some of Davis' generalizations concerning lower class aggression." (33) Yet it would seem to us that a distinction must be made between verbal disagreement or criticism and abusive language and aggressive behavior. Comparing the responses of lower class subjects to those of middle class controls among our own interviewees, it would seem that because the middle class child is able to verbalize a critical attitude toward his parents or adults in general--and because in adolescence this criticism is, in a sense, legitimated by what we earlier termed his awareness of what 'the book' says--he is less likely to hit out blindly in abusive language or physical acts of aggression. For our lower class subjects, on the other hand, conflict with parents is much more likely to be seen as part of a general process of 'getting into trouble' to which they refer frequently in many different contexts and which they seem to experience more as a 'happening' than as a consequence of their own actions or of the attitudes and actions of others. Here, subtle differences in the use of language are quite revealing. Lower class subjects often make statements such as "I have to obey her. She is my mother"; while middle class subjects are more likely to say that one should obey one's parents. In the first instance, the parental role is viewed as a natural and inevitable law; in the second, it is seen as a social norm which, though hedged by strong sanctions, is nevertheless not quite on a par with the movement of the planets and the cycle of the seasons.

Because of the tendency of many of our lower class subjects to 'reify' the role of their parents, we have attempted to make a rough assessment of parent-child relationships from interviewers' ratings based on a consideration of the total interview. While the following table must thus be seen as a rather subjective estimate, the writer, (having listened to all tapes on which this report is based), feels that it correctly reflects basic differences between our four 'subcultures.'

TABLE XXXIV

RESPONDENTS' RELATIONSHIP WITH FAMILY

	BV (N 28)	MS (N 30)	PH (N 30)	HT (N 20)
No positive relationship	66%	20%	25%	10%
Fair relationship	27	47	29	25
Good or close relationship	7	33	46	65
	100%	100%	100%	100%

As might be expected on the basis of other studies of lower class families, and in view of the significant number of homes in our sample in which no father is present, all lower class subjects are likely to feel closer to their mother than to their father. However, stable lower class subjects are more likely to express positive feelings toward their father or both parents than are subjects in the two unstable lower class New York groups. In addition, Prospect Hill respondents report a close or positive relationship with older siblings twice as frequently as do lower class New York respondents--despite the fact that they are no more likely than the New York youths to have older brothers and sisters. There is no difference, however, in the extent to which these three groups report a positive relationship with younger siblings.

Although as noted earlier most subjects have a tendency to see their parents as 'nice,' there is quite a difference in what being 'nice' means in this particular context. The following table summarizes responses to the question: "What do you like or dislike about your parents?" (This question was not asked of our middle class sample.)

It is interesting to note that all three lower class groups have greater difficulty articulating 'likes' and 'dislikes' with regard to their parents than is evident in their responses regarding teachers, friends or 'people' in general. Bayview respondents have the greatest trouble here--a total of only 24 responses of which more than half are critical. The Market Street group, which is still most involved with the family, has a higher response rate but offers only a low per cent of critical responses (15 per cent of 52 responses). Prospect Hill respondents, on the other hand, offer the largest number of comments on this question and, in the relative weight of critical responses, fall between the strong hostility of Bayview respondents and the high acceptance of parental authority of Market Street subjects.

TABLE XXXV

WHAT RESPONDENTS LIKE ABOUT THEIR PARENTS
(Per cent of responses)

	BV (N 11)	MS (N 44)	PH (N 54)
They give me things, they do things for me	30%	23%	31%
They do things with me, take me places	60	3	4
It's easy to talk to them. I am close to them	--	23	11
They're nice people to be around, easy to get along with	--	16	36
They keep me out of trouble	--	35	11
Other characteristics	10	--	7
	100%	100%	100%

WHAT RESPONDENTS DISLIKE ABOUT THEIR PARENTS
(Per cent of responses)

	BV (N 13)	MS (N 8)	PH (N 24)
They nag	30%	62%	34%
They won't give me things	--	--	8
One or both parents drink	23	--	4
Subject resents authority, restrictions or 'too many chores'	23	25	30
Parents are unfair, do not trust subject, do not keep promises, talk about subjects behind their backs, 'pick' on subjects	24	13	12
Mother is too permissive	--	--	4
Mother does not always dress nicely, always on the 'phone	--	--	8
	100%	100%	100%

Leaving aside the Bayview group, which gave very few responses to this question, we note the difference in emphasis between what Market Street and Prospect Hill respondents respectively like about their parents. The responses of stable lower class group are nearly equally divided between 'self centered' and 'de-centered' responses:--35 per cent of responses refer to what parents do for the subject ("They do things for me or with me," "Take me places," "Give me things"), 36 per cent refer more directly to personal qualities of the parents ("Nice to be around," "Easy to get along with"). This appreciation of people who are 'Nice,' 'Easy to get along with' or 'Alright' is also reflected in subsequent responses of Prospect Hill subjects regarding their perception of people in general and even of themselves. Hence, in the context of their perception of their parents, this response indicates not so much a specific parent-child relationship but a way of saying that their parents are 'Alright' or, as some put it approvingly, 'average' people.

For our Market Street respondents, the authority relationship with the parents ("They keep me out of trouble") is again somewhat more important than the material aspect of the relationship ("They give me things, take me places," etc.). Also, being able to talk to parents or being close to them is more important for this than for the two older groups, though the interviewers' ratings (based on a total review of each interview) would indicate that communication between youths and parents is more meaningful and adequate for the Prospect Hill group than for Market Street respondents.

On the 'dislike' side, the number of responses of the two lower class New York samples is too small to make comparisons very meaningful. Nagging, resentment of authority and 'chores,' lack of fairness, distrust or broken promises are the major complaints of all three groups, though the last item is more often stressed by the alienated Bayview sample than by the other two groups of lower class respondents. Complaints about parents who drink too much are most frequented in this same group (which also has the largest per cent of 'deviant' respondents), while complaints which tend to be rather reminiscent of a middle class vocabulary ("Too permissive," "Poor dresser," "Always on the 'phone") appear only among the stable lower class group.

The parallels between our subjects' perception of their parents and teachers should be readily apparent. Bayview students have the greatest trouble articulating the kinds of people their parents are and what they like or dislike about them; they are also the students who give the highest percentage of stereotyped responses when asked about their teachers' expectations. Just as their greatest single response concerning 'likes' about teachers is centered on their own needs ("He is nice, concerned, helpful," etc.), so most of the few responses they give with regard to liking their parents are centered on what parents do for or with subjects. Just as on the 'dislike' of teacher side they resent discipline, meanness, unfairness, distrust, etc., they also stress similar qualities in criticizing their parents. On the whole, however--and this may well be tribute to Bayview--the balance of positive and negative responses in their list of likes and dislikes may run in favor of the teacher rather than the parent.

For Market Street respondents, the nice, helpful and concerned teacher and the parent who gives one things or takes one places are also important. But nearly equally important is the teacher as disciplinarian and the parent who 'keeps one out of trouble.' However, while Market Street respondents are no more likely than their Bayview peers to take a 'de-centered' view of the teacher (in terms of relative emphasis placed on personal quality and competence), they are more likely than Bayview youths to see their parents in terms of personal qualities ("Nice people to be around," "Easy to get along with"). Furthermore, while many Bayview students see their school as a place where one can get one's work done and stay out of trouble, for the Market Street respondent it is the parent rather than the school that enforces the discipline one might lack if left to one's own devices ("Keep me out of trouble").

For Prospect Hill respondents as well, the teacher who cares and the parent who gives things or takes one places are important. Here again, their values are not fundamentally different from that of the two other lower class groups. But here, too, they evidence a 'value stretch' by the fact that the highest percentage of references to any single item on the 'like' or 'dislike' table refers to the personal rather than the 'provider' or 'authority' qualities of their parents--a mode of perception which we saw clearly reflected in the tendency of middle class subjects to stress the personal qualities and competence of the teacher.

Further indication of the quality of family relationships can be found in responses to the questions: "What does your family usually do together?," "With whom do you do it? How often?" (Again, the questions, which directly probe parent-child relationships, were not asked of our middle class group.)

The following table, based on activities reported by subjects, presents essentially the same picture as that derived earlier from interviewers' estimates of family relationships. Market Street subjects are more likely to engage in joint activities with members of their families than are Bayview subjects, and the Prospect Hill group reports both the greatest number of joint activities and the greatest frequency of such activities. At the same time, our data would tend to support the study by Deutsch and Associates quoted earlier which found no significant correlation between presence of parents at mealtime and reading scores, but which did find a correlation between reading scores and conversation at the dinner table.(34) Unfortunately, data do not allow us to distinguish between those subjects who combine the joint dinner and TV watching period and those who do not, but among our New York groups there seems to be a significant number who substitute watching TV for conversation around the dinner table. Similarly, Deutsch and Associates found that number of anticipated activities with relatives was not significantly correlated with reading scores but that anticipated number of cultural activities did show such a correlation.(35) Here again, we cannot tell which of the activities on the following table fall into the category termed 'cultural' in Deutsch's study. However, there is a difference between activities such as going places or visiting relatives and those we list specifically as joint activities with father or mother.

TABLE XXXVI

WHAT RESPONDENTS AND FAMILY DO TOGETHER
(Per cent of responses)

	BV (N 34)	MS (N 62)	PH (N 74)
Nothing much	34%	13%	7%
Go places	9	16	15
Joint activities with father only	3	3	15
Joint activities with mother only	9	11	19
Visit relatives	9	6	16
Eat dinner or watch TV together	27	35	20
Go to church together	9	8	8
Play together	--	8	--
Total	100%	100%	100%

FREQUENCY OF JOINT ACTIVITY
(Per cent of respondents)

	BV	MS	PH
	(N 30 for all groups)		
Family eats together every day	23%	27%	37%
Family frequently undertakes other joint activities	14	30	40
Only infrequent joint activities	63	20	13
Not clear how much joint activity	--	23	10
Total	100%	100%	100%

While going places or visiting relatives may or may not involve significant communication between parent and child, the activities listed as specifically undertaken with one or the other parent focus on a particular project or undertaking, a joint enterprise in which the youth as a helper or companion of the parent is meaningfully involved. While Prospect Hill subjects report more frequent activity with either parent, the difference between this group and their New York peers is especially notable with regard to joint activities with the father despite the fact that chances of a father's presence in the home is equal for all three lower class groups.

While we cannot present a full analysis of the pattern of parent-child communication for our three lower class subcultures, the following comparisons would seem to indicate that frequency of joint activities parallels a more positive pattern of communication. Of the Bayview group, only 7 per cent reported that they had been praised by their parents while 30 per cent reported that they had been scolded or addressed with sarcasm or derision. Of the Market Street group, 20 per cent reported praise and 17 per cent reported scolding or derision. Of Prospect Hill subjects, 47 per cent reported praise and 33 per cent reported reprimands, scolding or derision. Also, in response to the question: "Do your parents ever talk about their jobs at home?," only 10 per cent of the Bayview and Market Street groups answered in the affirmative. Of Prospect Hill subjects, on the other hand, one-third reported that their fathers had talked to them about their jobs and 27 per cent mentioned that their mothers had done so. Similarly, as noted earlier, Prospect Hill subjects were more knowledgeable about their parents' education and reported more frequently than Bayview youths that their parents had commented on their own limited educational opportunities as compared with those of the subject.

Not only do Prospect Hill subjects enjoy a better pattern of relationships within the nuclear family, they have also much stronger ties with the extended family. Thirty-seven per cent of Prospect Hill subjects report that they frequently visit relatives not living in the home, and another 40 per cent mention that they do so occasionally. In contrast, of each of the two lower class New York groups, only 10 per cent mention frequent visits to relatives not living in the home, and less than 10 per cent refer to occasional visits to such relatives. Similarly, nearly one-half of the Prospect Hill group report close ties with relatives not living in the home versus 7 per cent of the Bayview group and 20 per cent of the Market Street group. This difference may be accounted for in part by the fact that approximately 40 per cent of the Market Street group and a somewhat smaller percentage of the Bayview sample were Puerto Ricans whose uncles, aunts and cousins may well be living on the Island. However, even with the Negro subjects in our sample we get a sense of very significant differences in patterns of family relationships between the New York and Baltimore groups.

Even before a quantitative analysis of the tapes had been undertaken, the differences in family relationships, patterns of communication and joint activities within the family presented in this section were so evident that we tended to see them as the main causative factor explaining the differences among our three groups of lower class respondents. We still consider this factor highly significant. Yet before examining it further, we wish to present other data on interpersonal relationships and activities with persons other than family members which would seem to indicate that family relationships are only one of two elements vital for the development of 'social competence.'

Other Interpersonal Relationships

In the last section, we found significant differences between our four subcultures in the extent to which they perceive their parents in self-centered terms (i.e. in terms of what the parent does for or with the subject) and in de-centered terms (i.e. in terms of individual rather than relational characteristics). The same trend is evident in the following table which summarizes answers to the question: "What do you like or dislike about people?" or What makes you feel that some people are 'nice' and others are not?"

TABLE XXXVII

WHAT RESPONDENTS LIKE ABOUT PEOPLE
(Per cent of respondents)

	BV (N 30)	MS (N 30)	PH (N 30)	HT (N 20)
People who leave me alone	7%	--%	7%	--%
People who do things for me	20	13	10	--
People who are nice to me	20	20	--	5
People who don't get into trouble	7	3	13	5
People one can trust	7	--	3	5
Lively or active people who have a sense of humor	13	3	13	75
People who are friendly	--	30	83	20
People who share interests with me	--	20	27	15
Understanding people who relate to me or like me	17	27	10	20
Nice white people	3	--	--	--
People who are smart or work hard	--	17	--	5
People who share things with me	--	7	--	--
Total number of responses (including 16 responses of middle class subjects which did not fit above categories and are not shown on above table)	34	43	51	46

Totals exceed 100 per cent because of multiple responses.

(Continued on next page)

TABLE XXXVII (Continued)

SUMMARY: WHAT RESPONDENTS LIKE ABOUT PEOPLE
(Per cent of responses)

	BV (N 30)	MS (N 30)	PH (N 30)	HT (N 20)
People who do things for me, understand me, are nice to me, relate to me, leave me alone, etc.	68%	45%	13%	11%
People who share things or interests with me	--	18	16	6
References to personal qualities (don't get into trouble, friendly or lively people, people one can trust, smart people who work hard, etc.)	32	37	71	83
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%

WHAT RESPONDENTS DISLIKE ABOUT PEOPLE
(Per cent of responses)

	BV (N 23)	MS (N 61)	PH (N 80)	HT (N 36)
People who are unpleasant in their relationship with me	83%	34%	26%	14%
People who make trouble, bad people, people who cheat, use bad language, etc.	17	30	34	8
Snobs, gossips, people who fuss or pout	--	8	35	22
People who don't know how to act, rude, loud or rowdy people	--	8	--	14
Thieves, addicts, etc.	--	15	5	--
Other	--	5	--	42
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%

On both the 'like' and the 'dislike' tables, the per cent of 'self-centered' or 'relational' responses (i.e. responses emphasizing what people do for, with or against subject) decline as we move from the most alienated to the middle class control group.

On the 'like' table, we note the great emphasis given by Prospect Hill respondents to 'friendly' people, a category which corresponds to their high response rate on "Nice to be around, easy to get along with" in enumerating their 'likes' about their parents. Middle class respondents, on the other hand (to the extent to which their responses are at all comparable to that of the lower class groups) place less emphasis on the rather bland quality of friendliness and stress more active qualities such as liveliness, enterprise and a sense of humor.

On the 'dislike' table, we note again evidence of what was earlier called the 'value stretch' of the Prospect Hill group. On the one hand, they score high on a typical lower class item which is also stressed by their Market Street peers: "People who make trouble, bad people, people who use bad language, cheat, etc." On the other hand, they score equally high on an item which also seems of importance to the middle class group: "Snobs, gossips, people who fuss or pout, etc." Both the emphasis on 'friendly' people, and the dislike of snobs fits well into our impression gained from the interviews as a whole that for Prospect Hill subjects the ideal person is 'average' or 'OK' rather than a person with strong positive qualities or a strong action orientation. In the final section concerning subjects' self-image, we shall see that this same quality of 'being alright' is the most frequent response of Prospect Hill respondents when asked to describe themselves.

Another question in the interviews referred to the perception of friends. Here again Market Street respondents had a great deal of difficulty in articulating what they 'like' or 'dislike' about their friends, and the number of their responses was too small to be included in the following table. This group, with its strong emotional ties and field dependency, seemed unable to articulate characteristics of persons who are as close to them as parents or friends, but quite articulate when it came to more distant figures such as teachers or 'people in general.' Because some respondents had trouble with this question, it was suggested that interviewers rephrase it from "What do you like (or dislike) about your friends" to "Why do you make friends with some people and not with others?" This rephrased question led to two sets of noncomparable responses by middle and lower class subjects respectively; for while the older lower class subjects did in fact respond in terms of their relationships to their friends or their friends' personal characteristics, middle class respondents referred to patterns of social interaction which tend to create friendship groups such as having known each other prior to entering school, the formation of cliques within the school, etc. In further analysis of the data we intend to investigate in greater detail the relationship between the way in which the question was phrased and the type of response by middle and lower class subjects. For the time being, we can offer comparative data only on the Bayview and Prospect Hill samples.

TABLE XXXVIII

WHAT RESPONDENTS LIKE ABOUT FRIENDS
(Per cent of responses)

	BV (N 30)	PH (N 40)
They are friendly or lively	30%	23%
We help each other, share interests or do things together	43	42
They don't get into trouble	7	10
They know how to act	10	23
They are older than myself	10	2
Total	100%	100%

WHAT RESPONDENTS DISLIKE ABOUT FRIENDS
(Per cent of responses)

	BV (N 27)	PH (N 37)
They are mean, bullies, cheat, fight, steal, use bad language, etc.	43%	41%
They are gossips, suspicious, snobs, etc.	8	30
They start trouble or get into trouble	49	19
They don't know how to act	--	10
Total	100%	100%

In this instance, both Bayview and Prospect Hill respondents tend to give approximately the same percentage of 'self-centered' responses. However, it is interesting to note that while for the Prospect Hill group such 'relational' responses make up 35 per cent of their reasons for liking parents, 42 per cent of their reasons for liking friends and only 29 per cent of their reasons for liking people in general; the figures for the Bayview group are 90 per cent, 43 per cent and 68 per cent respectively. In other words, the Prospect Hill group would emphasize 'relational' characteristics most in their friends, less in their parents and least in strangers --a sequence which would seem to be quite natural for adolescents. Bayview students on the other hand emphasize 'relational' qualities more in regard to people in general than in regard to friends. In part, this reversal may reflect an inability of Bayview subjects to talk about 'people in general' in realistic terms; however, it is interesting to note that the interviewers' ratings of personal characteristics of individual subjects rate more than half of the Bayview sample, but only one-third of the Prospect Hill sample, as 'manipulative'; and it is quite possible that for the Bayview group 'people in general' indeed tend to a much larger degree to be rated in terms of what they can do for subject.

Data on likes and dislikes about friends again indicate the greater emphasis placed by Prospect Hill respondents on disliking snobs and gossips. Equally significant, however, is the relative emphasis placed by the two groups on another set of qualities which are again typical of the contrast between the unstable and stable lower class view. Of Bayview responses, 7 per cent concerning 'liked' characteristics and 49 per cent concerning 'disliked' characteristics refer to "Getting into trouble" while only 10 per cent refer to "Knowing how to act." For Prospect Hill subjects, on the other hand, only 10 per cent of the positive and 19 per cent of the negative responses refer to "getting into trouble" while 23 per cent of the positive and 10 per cent of the negative responses refer to "Knowing how to act." It is also interesting to note that for Prospect Hill respondents, the facts that friends "Know how to act" and "Are friendly and lively" carry equal weight, but for Bayview respondents, being friendly or lively is the most important 'nonrelational' characteristic causing them to like their friends.

Our data would also seem to indicate that important differences exist between the three lower class subcultures not only in what they like about their friends, but also in how they spend their time together. The following table summarizes responses to the question: "What do you and your friends usually do together?" (This question was not asked of middle class respondents.)

TABLE XXXIX

LEISURE TIME ACTIVITIES SHARED WITH FRIENDS
(Per cent of responses)

	BV (N 99)	MS (N 72)	PH (N 111)
Sports and other outdoor activities	36%	26%	23%
Talk, play, fool around, watch TV, listen to radio, visit	20	51	22
Go to parties or on dates	14	--	14
Go to movies, go on trips, visit museums, do homework together, make things together	2	16	12
Go to community center, clubs, church, Sunday School, volunteer activities, vocal groups, etc.	5	1	21
Fighting, drinking, playing cards, shooting pool, hustling, stealing	23	6	8
Total	100%	100%	100%

Because of the lower age of Market Street students, it is not surprising that they should not list partying and dating as group activities and that they should score high on informal activities such as talking, fooling around, listening to radio and TV, etc. Nor, given the nature of Bayview as a 'special school,' should it be surprising that this group should show the highest percentage of fighting, drinking, card playing and other activities which are usually part of the public stereotype of 'deviant' youth. However, what we consider most notable on this table is the relatively high percentage of Prospect Hill youths who list participation in formal group activities. Of course, there may be an element of self selection in that some of the Prospect Hill sample were contacted through community centers; yet what concerns us here is not the question of whether this pattern is characteristic for all youths in the area from which the sample was drawn (though we would suspect this to be the case) but the relationship between this pattern of participation in formal group activities and other characteristics of Prospect Hill respondents in our study. If relationships within the nuclear family were the only basis for 'social competence,' then the difference between Market Street and Prospect Hill respondents should not be as significant as our study indicates. However, if one takes into account that the ability to 'take the role of the other,' to 'de-center' one's perspective of people and events around one and to 'learn the rules of the game' depends not only on early childhood experiences with significant adults but also on the extent of one's contact with the wider community, then this difference in patterns of participation in formal group activities is highly significant. While we shall return to this topic in the concluding section of this report, we would like to present here two other sets of data which further indicate the differences in group participation and relatedness to persons outside the family which characterize our three lower class subcultures.

TABLE XL

CHURCH ATTENDANCE
(Per cent of respondents)

	BV	MS	PH
	(N 30 for each group)		
Reports that he attends church every week	13%	13%	20%
Reports that he attends regularly or frequently	--	10	27
Reports that he attends occasionally	--	7	30
Reports that he used to attend church "when I was younger"	--	--	27
Likes to sing in church choir	--	3	13
Likes to participate in social aspects of church activities	--	3	13

First, we note that Prospect Hill respondents are more likely to attend Church than are lower class New York subjects.

A very different but revealing indication of the extent to which different groups of subjects have meaningful contact with persons other than their parents also comes from responses to a question which attempted to elicit 'role models' as seen by our subjects. It is interesting to note that the highest rates of 'refusal' on this question came from the middle class group (33 per cent of respondents) and Bayview students (15 per cent of respondents). In both instances, refusal was based on the grounds that "I just want to be myself." When pressed, middle class subjects would often respond with "Well, I guess I ought to want to be like my (parent of the same sex)." Of Bayview respondents, on the other hand, two male subjects chose their mothers as role models. Some Market Street subjects were unable to answer the question, while Prospect Hill subjects were urged by the interviewer to name two role models: one with whom they were familiar and one they did not know personally. For these reasons, comparison across columns on the following table are only tentative. However, data are presented because they give an interesting picture of the relative weight of different types of role models for each group.

TABLE XLI

ROLE MODELS
(Per cent of respondents)

	BV (N 20)	MS (N 15)	PH (N 27)	HT (N 19)
Father or mother	15%	7%	11%	33%
Siblings	15	13	22	--
Other relatives	5	7	30	--
Friends and neighbors	--	13	22	--
Sports celebrities	33	13	18	5
Theatre, TV personalities and other public figures	10	13	30	32
Civil Rights leaders	--	--	22	--
Teachers	--	20	4	--
Gang leaders	5	--	--	--
Refuse to name role models	15	--	4	33

Totals exceed 100 per cent because of multiple responses.

For the Bayview respondents, the largest number of role model references is to sports celebrities. (This was also the group which gave the highest percentage of 'sports and outdoor activities' responses when asked what they do with their friends.) Parents and siblings are mentioned as role models with equal frequency, but other relatives are mentioned less frequently, and friends and neighbors not at all. In this case, the responses of Bayview students seem most similar to those of middle class respondents. Of the three lower class groups, they have the highest rate of 'refusals' and the lowest rate of references to friends, relatives and neighbors. This, however, must be viewed in the context of a total subculture. While responses of High Towers students reflect the typical middle class emphasis on individuality and the increasing concentration on the nuclear family which has been noted by students of 'the new middle class' in contemporary American society; Bayview students are not--by any available indicators--part of that subculture, and the relative isolation or alienation from friends, neighbors and the extended family (suggested by their role model responses) may be an indication of their alienation within a lower class milieu rather than of any similarity with middle class traits. However, the fact that Bayview respondents have the highest refusal rate of the three lower class subcultures may tell us something that the customary dichotomy between 'field dependent' and 'field independent' subjects obscures. Compared with Market Street subjects, both Bayview and Prospect Hill respondents tend to be more 'field independent'; but in the case of the latter, this trait is combined with a greater capacity for 'field articulation' (i.e. for obtaining a more independent and adequate picture of the situation in which they find themselves); in the case of the former, 'field independence' would seem equivalent to 'field rejection' (reflected in the fact that they give the highest percentage of stereotyped responses on parents' and teachers' expectations). Bayview youths' 'field independence' does not seem to lead to a more 'analytic' cognitive as it does in the case of Prospect Hill and High Towers subjects but, rather, to a refusal to engage in 'reality testing'--at least with regard to those aspects of their environment with which the persent interviews dealt.

Turning to Market Street subjects, we note that the largest percentage of their responses concerning role models refers to teachers, a model scarcely mentioned by the other groups. This again points to these youths' strong involvement with significant authority figures. At the same time, and like Prospect Hill subjects, these youths also tend to mention siblings and friends or neighbors and mention both of these latter groups more frequently then parents. On the other hand, the extended family plays a less significant part as role models for Market Street youths than for Prospect Hill respondents, which may well be due to the fact that, as noted earlier, this group tends to have less contact with such relatives.

The most significant set of data on the foregoing table seems to us to be the responses of Prospect Hill students. Per cent of references to siblings, other relatives, friends and neighbors respectively indicates that these students have meaningful contact with others than parents. Despite the fact that Prospect Hill respondents were asked to name two role models and at least one 'whom you know personally,' their responses covered a far greater range than those of the other two lower class groups; and while 15 per cent of Bayview students mention parents as role models, only 11 per cent of Prospect Hill students do so. Earlier sections have repeatedly suggested that Bayview respondents seem more alienated from or hostile to their parents than do Prospect Hill subjects. Hence, the difference in the choice of role models most likely indicates not a greater admiration for parents on the part of Bayview subjects but, rather, a greater inability to think of anybody else. (We might also note that Prospect Hill respondents, the only group to mention race relations on the Three Wishes Test, were the only group to mention civil rights leaders among their role models.)

In conclusion, we may note additional indications from the present data which support the impression that Prospect Hill respondents have more meaningful contact with persons outside the nuclear family than do Bayview and Market Street subjects.

For example, when referring to praise or criticism they received from various people inside and outside the home, 37 per cent of Prospect Hill subjects mention that they have been praised by persons other than parents and teachers versus only 7 per cent of Bayview and Market Street subjects. Similarly, 13 per cent of Prospect Hill subjects mention that they have been criticised by persons other than their parents or teachers while none of the lower class New York respondents mentions this fact.

It is also interesting to note that a comparison of subjective ratings of interviewers concerning quality of family relationships versus general interpersonal relationships for the various lower class groups once again supports the impression that Prospect Hill subjects are more apt to have relationship with persons outside the nuclear family than are Market Street and especially, Bayview subjects. While, as noted earlier, the interviewer's ratings are highly subjective, ratings for family and interpersonal relationships of individual subjects were done by the same persons and on the basis of the same criteria. Hence, we would consider a comparison of the relative standing of each group on one or the other count sufficiently significant to present them here in tabular form.

TABLE XLII

INTERVIEWERS' RATINGS OF FAMILY AND OTHER INTERPERSONAL RELATIONSHIPS
(Per cent of respondents)

	BV	MS	PH
	(N 30 for each group)		
No Positive Relationship			
Family	66%	20%	25%
Other interpersonal relations	73	33	20
Fair Relationship			
Family	27	47	29
Other interpersonal relations	19	30	30
Good or Close Relationship			
Family	7	33	46
Other interpersonal relations	8	37	50

Finally, a comparison of the relative weight of 'like' and 'dislike' responses on 'person centered' questions in our interviews would seem to indicate that meaningful relationships with persons outside the nuclear family need not be an uncritical one. The following table summarizes 'dislike' responses as per cent of all responses given with regard to parents, friends, teachers and 'people in general.'

TABLE XLIII

PER CENT OF 'DISLIKE' RESPONSES IN INTERPERSONAL RELATIONS
(Per cent of all responses referring to relationship indicated)

		BV	MS	PH
Attitude toward parents	N	25	52	78
Per cent responses under 'dislike'		54	15	30
Attitude toward friends	N	73	14	77
Per cent of responses under 'dislike'		59	64	48
Attitude toward teachers	N	107	225	187
Per cent of responses under 'dislike'		47	58	50
Attitude toward 'people in general'	N	57	104	131
Per cent of responses under 'dislike'		40	58	61

As we glance down the column for Prospect Hill respondents we find that negative responses increase with social distance--from 30 per cent for parents to 61 per cent for 'people in general.' For Bayview subjects, on the other hand, the lowest per cent of 'dislike' responses is registered for the socially most distant category ('people in general'), the highest per cent of negative responses is registered for friends. From the context of the interviews, we believe that the latter datum reflects not so much an alienation from friends as the heightened awareness on the part of Bayview youths that bad company may get you into trouble. In fact, some Bayview respondents note specifically that not going to school with one's friends gives one a greater chance 'to get your work done.' For the Market Street group, with its strong ties to the nuclear family, 'dislike' responses concerning parents are much lower than for the other two lower class groups; 'dislike' responses for persons beyond the family circle are, on the average, somewhat higher. (This would seem to support the picture indicated in the interviewer's ratings--Table XLII--which shows a greater discrepancy between family relationships and general interpersonal relations in the ratings of Market Street respondents than in the case of the other two lower class groups.)

Self-Image

One of the questions on the interviewing schedule was: "How would you describe yourself? What kind of person are you?"

Again, lower class New York respondents had more difficulty with this question than did Prospect Hill youths. A total of 18 Bayview subjects, 17 Market Street subjects and 29 Prospect Hill subjects answered this question; the total number of responses was 25, 21 and 44 respectively. However, the relative number of positive or negative responses (i.e. positive or negative descriptions of self) did not vary from group to group as much as we would have expected.

TABLE XLIV

POSITIVE AND NEGATIVE DESCRIPTIONS OF SELF
(Average per respondent)

	BV (N 18)	MS (N 17)	PH (N 29)
Positive descriptions of self	1.4	1.0	1.6
Negative descriptions of self	0.4	0.3	0.5
Excess of positive vs. negative descriptions of self	1.0	0.7	1.1

In terms of the use of personal versus interpersonal qualities in the description of self, there was no difference between Prospect Hill and Bayview respondents. Market Street respondents, on the other hand, described themselves only in terms of personal qualities. This concern with such qualities was also evident on the Three Wishes Test, and even on the question of role models some subjects in this group tended to respond with personal qualities they would wish to have rather than with reference to a person they might want to emulate. This tendency would seem to reflect the strong need of this group to attain the qualities demanded of them by their parents.

TABLE XLV

SELF-IMAGE
(Per cent of respondents who mentioned trait in describing themselves)

	BV (N 18)	MS (N 17)	PH (N 29)
Peaceful but will fight if need be	--%	6%	38%
Good person or good boy	38	53	34
An 'alright' person	11	12	45
Clever or smart	28	24	3
Quiet or shy	--	--	27
Admired by peers or superior to peers	22	[illegible]	14
Hard working	5	--	14
Trying to get along with everybody	--	--	17
Not too smart	17	6	10
Person who goes along with things	10	--	--

While to be 'good' (in terms of parental norms) is important to many subjects in each group, it is especially important to Market Street subjects. On the other hand, being an 'alright' person (i.e. alright in terms of society as the 'generalized other') is far more important to Prospect Hill subjects than to either of the New York groups. The latter also reflect not only the expectations of their parents but also the code of the streets by their greater emphasis on being clever or smart, superior or admired by peers. Also interesting is the fact that while some Prospect Hill subjects describe themselves as 'trying to get along with everybody,' Bayview subjects refer to 'going along with things,' a similar quality but expressed in the first instance in interpersonal and in the second instance in more alienated terms.

That 17 per cent of Bayview subjects should describe themselves as 'not too smart' is less surprising than that 27 per cent of Prospect Hill respondents should see themselves as 'quiet or shy.' From the context of the interviews, these are mainly responses of subjects who seem to feel somewhat uncomfortable in interpersonal relations and would like to be more 'outgoing.' The following data from the interviewer's ratings would seem to support the self-image of the 'shy' Prospect Hill respondent despite the fact that this group also receives the highest rating for 'outgoing' personalities. Difficulties in interpersonal relations seem to take different forms in our four subcultures: What is 'shyness' in Prospect Hill is 'withdrawal' in Market Street and 'hostility' among Bayview subjects.

TABLE XLVI

INTERVIEWERS' RATINGS OF SUBJECTS' CHARACTERISTICS
(Per cent of respondents)

	BV	MS	PH
	(N 30	for each	group)
Shy or immature	8%	--%	23%
Withdrawn	34	33	20
Manipulative	16	15	10
Anxious about performance	8	7	8
Outgoing	11	4	27
Hostile	42	11	3
Apathetic	19	4	--
Possibly autistic	16	--	--

The above table shows Market Street respondents again midway between Bayview and Prospect Hill subjects. They do not appear as hostile or as apathetic as the former group, nor as outgoing as the latter. At the same time, they have a lower percentage of shy, immature or withdrawn subjects than either group. What really seems to differentiate Market Street students from their peers on either side of the continuum we have drawn in this study becomes evident in the following summary of interviewers' ratings of 'perception of social norms.' More than either of the other two groups, Market Street respondents would seem to be dominated by the 'official world view' of their parents, whether in the form of strongly internalized norms or stereotypes parroted without much comprehension.

TABLE XLVII

INTERVIEWERS' RATING OF PERCEPTION OF SOCIAL NORMS
(Per cent of respondents)

	BV	MS	PH
	(N 30	for each	group)
Fair perception of what is required	37%	17%	50%
Strongly internalized perception of norms	3	43	30
Stereotyped perception of norms	40	40	20
Rejection of social norms	20	--	--
	100%	100%	100%

In contrast to Bayview respondents, Market Street subjects rate high on the internalization of social norms (higher than the more 'de-centered' Prospect Hill subjects) and have no rating in the category 'rejection of social norms.' However, compared with Prospect Hill subjects, twice as many Bayview and Market Street Subjects are rated as presenting a stereotyped perception of social norms. In other words, Bayview subjects exhibit the most negative attitude toward social norms; Market Street respondents exhibit a very positive but also quite stereotyped attitude toward social norms; while Prospect Hill subjects exhibit the highest propensity for 'a fair perception of what is required' but a lower degree of internalization than the Market Street group and a lesser degree of stereotyped definitions of social norms than either the Market Street or Bayview groups.

This completes the presentation of the present data. In the following section we shall turn to interpreting their meaning both in terms of the original focus of this research (perception of a 'conflict of subcultures') and in terms of some implications drawn from the comparison of our four subcultures (which was not anticipated in the original research plan).

DISCUSSION

The Conflict of Subcultures and the Student

The findings presented in this report show that our lower class subjects are not aware of a 'conflict of subcultures' between their home environment and the presumably middle class oriented public school. This observation need not invalidate the 'conflict of subcultures' hypothesis on which this research was based. It indicates, however, that the 'objective' definition of the situation as described by the observer--such as educators or social scientists--is not congruent with the 'subjective' definition of at least one party in the system of social interaction which makes up our public schools: the student himself. The discrepancy between 'objective' and 'subjective' definitions raises a number of important questions.

Firstly, the fact that significant differences between middle and lower class subcultures do indeed exist, does not prove that a conflict between these subcultures must be evident in the public school. Unfortunately, a great deal of what has been written on this topic is based on social class analysis in general, rather than on a direct observation of the school as a social system. Yet the knowledge that a largely middle class oriented staff will bring certain expectations to the school setting which lower class youth is unlikely to meet, does not tell us what actually happens when the battle is joined in the classroom.

Our findings report only the subjective perception of the student. They seem corroborated, however, by a study of elementary school classrooms in four urban neighborhoods undertaken by Eleanor Leacock. In a paper entitled "Personality and Culture Theory in the Field of Education," Professor Leacock reports:

> Initially I assumed a so-called 'value clash' would be significant and that the 'middle class' character of the schools would find a ready response from middle class children, but would create difficulties for poor white and Negro children who hold 'lower class values.' As the research progressed, however, it became apparent that this was an oversimplification of the case to the point of distortion.(36)

Professor Leacock found that attitudes towards the student, responses to the student's communications, the organization of the classroom, the allocation of responsibilities, or the ratio of positive as against negative evaluations of the student's work tended to vary with the teacher's perception of the social class position of the pupils.

> Teachers are not as sensitive to low status children as individuals, do not respect them, and are not as prepared to listen to them as they are to middle class children; *and not so much because these children have 'lower class values' as because they are lower class.* (Italics in the original.)(37)

The extent to which the social class position of the student may affect actual classroom procedures, is indicated in the following incident reported by Professor Leacock:

> The teacher of the middle income white fifth grade spoke at length in her interview of the importance for the children of learning how to handle leadership responsibility, and she structured committee reports so that children led the sessions and called on other children for discussion and comment. In the low income Negro fifth grade, by contrast, the teacher stated that she thought the children should learn from school 'first of all, discipline.'(38)

Our New York middle and lower class subjects respectively might well have been taken right out of the classrooms conducted by these two teachers. The views of the teacher in the middle income white fifth grade who stressed the importance of 'learning how to handle leadership responsibilities' are echoed in the response of a High Towers student regarding the purpose of education: "Education is important, because today's children are tomorrow's leaders." The view of the teacher in the low income Negro fifth grade, on the other hand, who stressed that the students should learn 'first of all, discipline' is clearly reflected in the responses of our two lower class New York groups regarding their teachers' expectations.

In the light of Professor Leacock's findings, it is easy to understand why our lower class subjects fail to perceive a conflict of subcultures. Instead of confronting them with a set of unfamiliar norms and expectations, the system adjusts to their limitations as seen by the teacher. They are less articulate than the middle class child, and less attention is paid to their communications. They are not familiar with committee procedures and reports, and there are no such activities in their classroom. Their academic efforts are less likely to be encouraged by their parents, and they are more likely than the middle class child to receive negative comments from their teacher. They are more alienated, and they are more likely to be defined as outsiders and failures by their teachers.(39)

In all fairness, however, we must note that if the presumably middle class oriented public school tends to reinforce the definition of the situation which the lower class student brings from his home environment, the fault may not be that of the individual teacher. The system is more than the sum total of its participants. In our interim report we noted:

> The setting of our urban public schools, especially of those located in low income areas, is hardly conducive to the realization of the lofty ideals proffered in the standard texts on the philosophy of education. Faced with overcrowded classrooms, shortage of materials, mandatory curriculums, mountains of paperwork and recalcitrant students, the often inexperienced teacher is hardly in a position to expound on the beauties of learning for its own sake. If he is to spare the rod (and most schools frown on corporal punishment in theory if not in practice), the most direct and potent argument in defense of education is the same that confronts the student in the lower class home: the consequences of his actions for his future career. When the chips are down--as they are in the urban slum school most of the time--the promise of expanding intellectual horizons is less effective than the threat of contracting economic opportunities.
>
> The similarities between home and school as perceived by the lower class student are not limited, however, to questions of motivation. Often the physical environment is quite similar: noisy, overcrowded, dirty, neglected and ugly. Nor are the differences in the human environment as obvious as one might wish. In all but a handful of progressive private schools, discipline and the coverage of the prescribed curriculum must take precedence over self-expression and a spontaneous and meaningful exchange between teacher and pupil. This enforced emphasis on order and task-oriented communication provides a further set of clues which tend to highlight the similarities between the school and the lower class home. As has been pointed out in a number of studies, the lower class home tends to be more authoritarian, more given to the communication of orders than emotions, and more geared to getting by than getting ahead. These trends are clearly reflected in the responses of our subjects whose operational ethics (and the ethics of their parents as reported by them) may well be summarized as "do your work and stay out of trouble" and "don't bother me and I won't bother you." As any student of the Dale Carnegie method will quickly recognize, such maxims are of little value for the youth who must make his way in the new world of the organization men. They are, however, quite functional from the

point of view of those who must cope with the turbulent world of the slum school.(40)

In the light of the foregoing, we would argue that the validity and value of the 'conflict of subcultures' hypothesis must be considered in the context in which it is used.

1. If the purpose is to sensitize the teacher to subculture differences between the student's world and his own and, thereby, to improve communication between teacher and student, the hypothesis is both valid and useful.
2. If the purpose is to explain what actually happens in the classroom, the hypothesis is probably not valid and not very useful. The school as a social system must be understood in terms of its own properties and dynamics which cannot be deduced from the characteristics which the participants bring to the process of interaction by virtue of their respective socioeconomic status.
3. Where the purpose is to improve the school, the hypothesis is often a Red Herring, legitimating all kinds of charges and counter-charges such as: middle class teachers do not care about our children; lower class parents do not support the school and its aims; the curriculum must reflect the 'culture' of the students; lower class children do poorly in school because they are 'culturally deprived'; white teachers cannot teach 'black' culture; let's uphold 'middle class values,' etc.

If culture is defined as what some sociologists term 'high culture' there is room for argument and flexibility concerning the 'culture' which our public schools should teach. There is something to be said for Shakespeare and Keats, but also for Eldridge Cleaver and the biography of Malcolm X. In fact, it would seem that the two worlds need not be mutually exclusive. In a different and more crucial sense, however, the 'conflict of subcultures' hypothesis detracts attention from the fact that in many respects the urban public school has no options as to what 'culture' it teaches.

As we have attempted to show in the section on Purpose of Education, in the minds of our lower class subjects school is firmly linked with preparation for a job. While this may be painful to educators who conceive of their task as 'broadening the horizon of the student,' it would seem rather reasonable and realistic from the point of view of the lower class child. Even the Sages of the Talmud knew that 'without bread there can be no learning.' How much more starkly must the importance of 'bread' stand out in the minds of the children of the affluent society, in which much if not all of a man's worth is rated in terms of material possessions.

The school which fails to prepare the student for the world of work--be it directly upon graduation from high school or via a college career-- is perpetrating a fraud not only upon its charges but also upon society. Hence, the basic issues in public education cannot be debated solely in terms of the relative merits of contrasting subcultures. If the pupil is to succeed in a world in which the competition for success is a game largely played by middle class rules, the school which fails to acquaint the lower class student with any subculture other than his own, is hardly doing him a favor. It matters little whether the cause is a class bias which scales down standards and classroom activities to 'what you can expect from these kids,' or whether the motive is 'respect for the subculture of the student.' A deep affection for the heritage of one's own group is by no means incompatible with a healthy respect for the usefulness of certain middle class mores and folkways.

We may illustrate this point by reference to an experience related by the graduate student who interviewed our Prospect Hill subjects and who subsequently worked at a Job Corps summer program. One of the youths who were to be placed through this program would walk around the office without removing his hat. When he was finally sent on a job interview, this young woman told him: "Now I don't mind if you wear your hat around here. But Whitey does't like it. So when you go to that interview you take that hat off or I won't make another appointment for you."

Obviously, the New York City Board of Education cannot develop a curriculum based on a distinction between what is alright between 'us' and how one deals with 'Whitey.' However, we feel that a great deal of clarity could be brought into the hazy and unstructured world of many of our subjects if the 'conflict of subcultures' were articulated rather than sidestepped by an attempt to attune the teacher to the subculture of the student.

Equality is not achieved by denying class differences or putting a few black faces into a second grade reader. Equality is achieved either by revising the criteria for success, or by giving everybody equal access not only to technical skills but also to a knowledge of the less explicit 'rules of the game' by which success is achieved. Since American society shows little inclination to do the former, it would seem incumbent upon our public schools to proceed along the latter path.

An angry Black youth, referring to the writer's Jewish origin, once told her: "Don't give us no charity; teach us how you made it." Given the realities of contemporary American society, this is in truth the heart of the matter. If we are to teach lower class children 'how to make it,' it will not be enough to acquaint the middle class teacher with the world of the lower class child. This is only the beginning. The real problem is how to prepare the student for a life different from that of his parents, a life in which his 'culture'--expressive, sustaining and valuable as it may be in many ways--can prove greatly 'dysfunctional.' Seen from this perspective, our findings are an indictment of the public school not because it allows a conflict of subcultures to exist, but because this conflict is seldom evident to the student. As we have attempted to show, our lower class New York subjects relate to the school as the factory worker relates to his job; they perceive their teacher not unlike a kind of foreman; and their educational philosphy can be summed up in the maxim: attend, obey and 'learn.'

This is what their parents taught them. This is what they expected school to be. This is what school has been for them. But this is hardly the way 'to make it' in this or any other highly industrialized country in the 1960's.

'Social Competence': Differences Between Subcultures in this Study

The review of our findings concerning the 'conflict of subcultures' and the student leads us to the question: How can one teach lower class persons to 'make it' in contemporary American society? A comparison of the two groups in our study who are most likely to succeed (i.e. Prospect Hill and High Towers) as against the two lower class New York groups, indicates that one of the crucial factors might be what earlier in this report we already referred to as 'social competence.'

Webster defines competent as 'answering to all requirements; adequate; fit; capable.' In this sense, 'social competence' is that quality which enables an individual to respond adequately and effectively in interpersonal situations. It is a quality as important in national campaigns for political office as in the less demanding pursuits for which Job Corps or JOIN applicants are supposedly being prepared.

At various points in this report, we have noted characteristics more prominently found in Baltimore than in New York respondents, which would seem to account for the significant differences in 'social competence' between stable and unstable lower class subjects. We may now summarize our observations as follows:

1. Competence in interpersonal relations requires that one is

relatively at ease with one's fellowmen and that, if needed, one feels free to defend one's own point of view. The first is unlikely to be the case for Prospect Hill respondents with their high level of hostility; and the latter would be quite difficult for Market Street subjects with their great 'field dependence,' their involvement with authority often internalized in the form of fairly stereotyped maxims, and their emphasis on being 'good.' It further requires that one defines such situations as encounters which, in some measure, can be affected by one's own actions. (The high correlation found in the Coleman report(41) between a sense of 'fate control' and academic performance would seem to indicate that this quality may be directly related to school achievement.) However, we noted that for Bayview and Market Street students, 'getting into trouble,' or academic failure seem to be largely a series of 'happenings' over which they have little influence.

2. To interact effectively with others, one must learn 'the rules of the game.' Our data would indicate that this can be achieved in two (by no means mutually exclusive) ways: High Towers subjects show a great awareness of such 'rules,' but we get the impression that their knowledge exceeds their experience. Their home environment has taught them 'how the game is played,' in some instances even before they were old enough to participate in it. For this reason, High Towers subjects often seem similar to Market Street respondents in the extent to which they echo the voices of their parents. However, in contrast to the rather sophisticated world view reflected in our middle class interviews, Market Street parents seem to teach their young little more than 'be good, learn, and stay out of trouble.'

Prospect Hill subjects, on the other hand, seem much less dependent on parental guidance. Their greater range of meaningful contacts with persons outside their home and their greater participation in structured group activities apparently enabled them to learn the rules from practical experience. Of course, their basically good relationship with their parents may have encouraged exposure to such influences and experiences in the first place; but having more opportunity for learning 'the rules of the game' outside the home, they are less dependent on parental admonitions and have a broader and less stereotyped perspective on what is required in different settings.

Bayview respondents, as well, are more detached from parental authority than are the two younger groups in our study. Their failure to 'learn the rules of the game' must be traced partly to the fact that, (in contrast to Prospect

Hill students) they have few opportunities to do so in contacts outside the nuclear family, and partly to their ideas about rules in general. In their responses concerning their likes and dislikes about the school, we noted their strong emphasis on the role of external authority in helping them 'to get their work done,' but also their strong resentment of such authority. We would suspect that they have a similar attitude with regard to all 'rules' whatever the game might be. To them, playing by the rules, any rules other than those of their immediate peers, is to submit to somebody else's authority rather than to establish the basis for a process of social interaction. In other words, for Prospect Hill subjects, a knowledge of the rules facilitates participation in the game--and since the game is worth playing, the rules are worth learning. For Bayview students, rules are not something to be learned but to be 'psyched out,' something to be discovered by dint of cleverness and non-participant observation, in order to be bypassed or evaded as much as possible.

3. While knowing 'the rules of the game' is essential to any effective process of interaction, one must also be able to respond to the specific aspects of the situation in which one finds oneself. This means that one must know not only what is generally required, but what is expected by one's present role partners, or how one may translate one's own expectations into verbal or non-verbal communications which will bring the desired response from the particular individuals with whom one interacts. Throughout this report, we have referred to this process as 'taking the role of the other' and we have indicated the extent to which Baltimore respondents seem superior in this respect to lower class New York subjects. We would suspect that this difference is related to a combination of the following characteristics more frequently found in Prospect Hill subjects: a good relationship to early authority figures which enables the individual to relate to others without undue anxiety and, hence, without undue distortions in interpersonal perception; the greater ability to view others from a 'de-centered' perspective, i.e. as persons in their own right with their own personal characteristics rather than only in terms of their immediate relationship to the needs or wishes of the observer; a wider range of experiences with different persons and situations.

In other words, 'social competence' requires the ability to adequately assess a given situation in order to act in such a fashion as to maximize the chances for a desirable outcome in interpersonal transactions. Seen in this light, 'social competence' is not a variable which can be measured in absolute terms but which must be evaluated in the context of the particular situation in which the actor finds himself. From a middle class point of view, for example, our High Towers respondents seem far more sophisticated and 'socially competent' than Prospect Hill subjects. Yet listening to the interviews as a whole, we are impressed with the fact that Prospect Hill subjects seem no less capable of dealing effectively with the social and interpersonal situations to which they are exposed. In comparing Prospect Hill to Bayview or Market Street students, on the other hand, the difference in 'social competence' reflected in our interviews is much more pronounced than any difference between the socioeconomic status or educational attainments of Baltimore and New York lower class parents.

Since differences in 'social competence' are not correlated with differences in social class among the four groups in our study, this characteristic may not be a class-linked trait. Indeed, we are inclined to see it as a psychological variable which stands in a dialectic but not deterministic relationship to social class. Since it is evident that there are considerable differences in 'social competence' not only between the four groups in our study but also between subjects within the same group, we expect that the comparison of different interviews within the same subculture, in which we are presently engaged, will enable us to further refine our analysis of this trait, its etiology, and its relationship to social stratification.

IMPLICATIONS

Our findings concerning the 'conflict of subcultures' hypothesis and the significance of 'social competence,' lead us to a consideration of the relative merits of these two concepts as analytic tools in policy oriented research and in the development of social policies. In the two preceding sections, we have attempted to show how the 'subculture' perspective may obscure rather than illuminate some of the basic issues in public education. On the other hand, we have noted that the salient characteristic which distinguishes the promising from the 'disadvantaged' students in our study seems to be their greater ability to correctly perceive and respond to the requirements of their social world, and to evidence 'social competence' in interpersonal situations. In this concluding section, we shall extend these observations beyond the specific focus of our study to questions concerning social policy in general.

The theoretical weaknesses of the social-classes-as-subcultures frame of reference have been pointed out in the relevant literature and need not be reassessed here.(42) It may be useful to note, however, how this idea became popular in the context of current debates over social policy; what it was supposed to explain; and why it is probably the wrong tool for the job it was designed to facilitate.

The recent concern with lower class subculture and its effect on the fortunes of the 'disadvantaged' arose in the context of what one might term the 'mystery of poverty in the affluent society.' Its purpose was to tackle a problem which had become evident in the relative ineffectiveness of urban renewal (which tended to create 'movable slums' rather than more livable cities)(43) and the phenomenon of a 'sticky' unemployment rate which, Keynesian economics notwithstanding, failed to respond to a steadily growing GNP. In other words, it seemed that the creation of new opportunities was not enough. Apparently, the lower or lowest strata of the population seemed unable to avail themselves of new 'opportunity structures.' Why was this so? What could be done about it?

It was at this point that the social sciences made a somewhat dubious contribution to social policy by introducing the concept of 'lower class subculture.' The policy makers needed a tool kit; but the social scientist presented them with a bulldozer.

The term 'culture' refers to the complex and subtly meshed fabric of material objects, values, beliefs, assumptions, habits, customs, laws, etc. which a society develops in the course of its existence. In this context, subculture refers to the same categories of phenomena to the extent to which they are shared by a subgroup of subsociety but are not part of the dominant culture, i.e. of the culture of the larger society in which the subunit finds itself. In the contemporary United States, there are many such subcultures, but few if any are closed systems, and their relationship to the dominant culture is by no means well defined.(44) But even if we could say with certainty just what constitutes lower class 'subculture' in this country and how this relates to the dominant cultural system, the term 'culture' would nevertheless remain a rather unsuitable tool for the policy purposes for which it is invoked:

(a) While cultures can be described only in terms of the traits of which they are composed, the same trait in a different context may have a very different meaning. One of the basic problems with the 'culture of poverty' concept is that while Lewis himself stresses that the traits he imputes to it must not be taken out of context, it is exactly in this fashion that his work is used in discussions of social policy. The social scientist can only describe culture as a configuration of interrelated traits. Yet the policy maker, attempting to take culture into account, can deal only with one or a few selected traits at a time.

(b) Culture embraces values to which the individual may have a deep commitment as well as attitudes and habits which are only an adaptive response to a particular set of circumstances and might readily change if these circumstances were altered. However, it is often extremely difficult to differentiate between values and adaptive responses since the observed behavior they produce may well be the same. Thus, the radical tends to regard most cultural traits as adaptive responses which will change as soon as the policy he advocates will be implemented, while the conservative sees most cultural traits as value determined and, hence, anticipates that they will not be affected by social policies.

(c) Concentration on the 'subcultural' base of social problems diverts attention from other aspects of what is commonly a multicausal phenomenon and, thereby, possibly from other and more effective avenues of amelioration. If more attention were paid to differences between people in the same subculture, i.e. why given the same subculture and confronted with the same situation some manage more effectively than others, we might find that some of the variables which distinguish the successful from the unsuccessful actor might be easier to manipulate by social policy than 'cultural traits.'

We would argue that the concept of 'social competence' focusses on many of the same issues which the concept of 'subcultures' was to explain, and that it does so less ambiguously and more programmatically. A few examples may illustrate our point.

(a) As long as social policy is discussed with reference to subcultures, one cannot escape the popular notion that the solution to our social ills lies in 'making everybody middle class.' Yet what is in fact required is something less global and more sharply aimed at a specific goal which earlier we termed 'teaching them how to make it.'

The subculture school of thought seems to imply that one will 'make it' once one has adopted middle class values and ways of life. We would argue, conversely, that once one has learned to 'make it,' one has entry to middle class status--if that is what one desires. Furthermore, we believe that the issue is not so much 'values' (unless one postulates that the poor 'value' poverty or do not 'value' decent housing) as the social and interpersonal techniques we have termed 'social competence.' Middle class 'values' --such as the punctuality, honesty, hard work, or sobriety we preach to the poor-- are more apt to loom large in the qualifications for a good janitor than for a corporation president. By this, we do not wish to denigrate these values whose absence from our public life has been rightly deplored. We would only plead that the poor, who so often must settle for our used cars and clothing, ought not to be made the heirs of the Protestant Ethic where these ethics are rapidly discarded by Whyte's 'organization man'(45) and his successors.

(b) Stating the same issue in a more scholarly fashion, we may note that there are good reasons to believe that social science theories regarding the relationship between culture and social action may need revision in the light of what is sometimes referred to as 'the changing American character' (which is really the changing character of the American middle and upper strata).(46) It seems that increasingly the value (i.e. the internalized) components of culture become less important and that actions, especially the actions of successful individuals in this society, become more and more geared to the exigencies of specific situations. If this is correct, then we are rapidly approaching a situation in which culture undergoes a similar transformation as has been advocated for vocational training. Specific subcultural traits become less significant, and not the substance of what one has learned, but the ability to acquire new technical skills and new 'cultural' adaptations will become the most important quality of the successful American of the future. And it is just this capacity for adaptation to different social situations rather than the possession of autonomous and stable culture-bound values and patterns of action which is reflected in a high degree of 'social competence.'

(c) The use of the concept of 'social competence' may allow us to hold to a clearer dividing line between what is interesting for the social scientist and what is useful for the policy maker. At present, there seems to be a tendency to regard any phenomenon which shows a correlation with low income--and, hence, is considered part of 'lower class culture'--as a matter of concern for the policy maker. In many instances, however, the relationship between that trait and social policy objectives is by no means clearly established. On the other hand, as we have attempted to show, it should be possible to analyze the components of 'social competence' independent of the complex web of subcultural traits and, starting from these components, to trace specific subcultural characteristics which may promote or inhibit them.

Having said all this, we are faced with the question: How can one measure 'social competence?' Can it be taught, and if so, how? Can it be promoted by 'social intervention' and, if so, by what policies? Obviously, our data do not enable us to answer such broad questions. However, we would venture some guesses as to the directions in which the answers may be found.

(a) While the measurement of 'social competence' would require a closer analysis of this phenomenon than our data permit, our study would seem to indicate that it can be assessed more easily than cultural traits. Our findings suggest that it involves a number of components: confidence and lack of undue anxiety in interpersonal relations; a sense of 'fate control'; 'knowing the rules of the game'; and 'taking the role of the other.' Most of these components have already been studied empirically: levels of anxiety in interpersonal relations have been studied by psychiatrists and psychologists; 'fate control' was a variable measured in the Coleman report;(47) role taking ability has been studied experimentally by Fawell and Associates.(48) Though the writer is not aware of any empirical research testing what we have termed here 'knowing the rules of the game' it would seem that a testing instrument geared to specific social situations could well be constructed.

(b) We have noted that 'social competence' seems to be a psycho-social phenomenon, involving psychological traits in their dynamic interaction with social status and culture. Hence, any understanding and investigation of the factors which further or inhibit the development of this characteristic would require more than the customary teamwork between specialists from different disciplines. It would involve a truly interdisciplinary conceptual frame of reference, for which Rubenfeld's attempt to construct a psycho-social typology(49) may well serve as a starting point.

(c) 'Social competence' is specific to specific tasks and situations. This would suggest that social policies attempting to strengthen this trait ought to be based on a kind of 'job analysis' with regard to those qualities directly relevant to social policy objective.

(d) 'Social competence' is involved in all interpersonal situations: in the home, the school, the workplace, the hospital, the welfare office, etc. Hence, if we can define ways in which this capacity can be enhanced (and single out those which tend to discourage its development) we do not need a special training program with its own special set of experts. We rather need to gear existing institutions and their personnel to this purpose.

(e) We have today a number of techniques which, each in its own way, seek to improve 'social competence': psychodrama; the Training Laboratory of the National Education Association; community actions; group therapy; community psychiatry; and probably many others with which the writer is not acquainted. The problem with these techniques is that each seeks to stake out its own territory; each is available to only a limited number of persons; and each trains its own specialists. The writer suspects, however, that it would be possible to single out certain basic components which these approaches have in common and to derive from them a set of techniques which could be used in the context of the institutions with which lower class individuals come into contact.

In short, we would argue that an effort to increase the 'social competence' of the 'disadvantaged' need not require a new set of agencies or programs, but rather an understanding of the phenomenon; an awareness of its relevance for social policy; and the utilization of existing techniques and facilities across the boundaries of professional specialization. Yet, given the realities of contemporary American society, an undertaking which does not have its own institutionalized base, is likely to fall by the wayside. If the concept of 'subculture' has been more popular than its usefulness would seem to warrant, it is because of its relevance for a variety of specialists, such as anthropologists; sociologists; educators; criminologists; social workers; and policy makers. Whether the concept of 'social competence' could find a similar set of influential ombudsmen we cannot tell.

SUMMARY

This study was based on the hypothesis that there is a 'conflict of subcultures' between the home environment of lower class students and the middle class oriented public schools in low income areas. (This presumed conflict has been a focal point in the recent debate concerning the education of the 'culturally disadvantaged,' and has been considered one of the causes of the poor scholastic achievement of many lower class pupils.)

The purpose of the study was to determine whether such a 'conflict of subcultures' is perceived by the student himself and, if so, how he deals with it.

Data were collected through loosely structured, open-ended interviews with lower class students in New York City and Baltimore, Maryland. A small middle class control group was also included in the study. The age of the respondents ranged from 12 to 16 years. Average length of the interviews was one hour. All interviews were tape recorded and the majority summarized with the aid of a coding guide, which made quantification of major variables possible.

Out of 190 interviews recorded in the course of the research, this report gives detailed findings for a total of 110 subjects, divided into four groups according to social class and/or type of school attended. These groups show significant differences in educational attainment as well as in a number of other important characteristics and are, therefore, presented as four 'subcultures.' They include:

> 30 subjects from an unstable lower class environment attending a special school for students with behavior and learning problems within the New York City public school system.
>
> 30 subjects from the same social class attending a regular New York City public school in a low income area.
>
> 30 subjects from a more stable lower class environment residing in the Baltimore area and attending a variety of public schools.
>
> 20 middle class subjects attending a private school in New York City.
>
> Most of the lower class subjects were Black or Puerto Rican. Middle class subjects were white.

The interviews covered the following main areas:

(a) Importance and purpose of education as perceived by subjects and their parents

(b) Subjects' attitudes regarding the school, their teachers and academic subjects

(c) Subjects' educational, occupational and other aspirations and plans

(d) Subjects' perception of the expectations of their parents and teachers

(e) Subjects' interpersonal perception, attitudes and relationships, concerning their families, friends and 'people in general'

(f) Joint activities with family and other leisure time activities of subjects

(g) Subjects' self image and role models

Data do not reveal any awareness of a 'conflict of subcultures' on the part of lower class subjects. This fact may be traced to:

(a) Parents of lower class subjects, no less than their teachers, stress the importance of 'getting an education,' 'doing your work,' and 'behaving' in the classroom.

(b) Even beyond these basic requirements, lower class subjects seem to perceive no norms, expectations or attitudes in the school setting which are more 'middle class' than those they know from their home environment. This subjective perception of respondents seems corroborated by a study of four urban classrooms, reported by Eleanor Leacock, who found that teachers tend to adjust their attitudes and practices to the perceived social class level of the student body.

(c) Data indicate that the two most 'disadvantaged' groups in the study tend to exhibit a 'relational' rather than 'analytic' cognitive style and, compared to academically more successful subjects, a stronger tendency to stereotype authority figures, and less ability to 'de-center' in their interaction with their social environment. These characteristics would make it difficult for them to discern 'subcultural' differences and conflicts, even if the latter were more evident in the classroom than they appear to be.

Furthermore, a detailed comparison of the four subcultures in the study suggests that what distinguishes the more 'disadvantaged' from the more successful groups is a lack of 'social competence,' a term defined as that quality which enables an individual to respond adequately and effectively in interpersonal situations. The relative deficiency in 'social competence' on the part of unstable lower class subjects is evident in the following interrelated traits:

(a) A relatively high degree of hostility, withdrawal or dependency;

(b) a strong need for 'controls from without,' often coupled with strong resentment of the authority which imposes such controls;

(c) a lack of an internal sense of 'fate control';

(d) a tendency to view situations, persons and social norms in terms of (often inappropriate) stereotypes;

(e) difficulty in perceiving the logical and necessary relationships between events;

(f) little knowledge of the 'rules of the game' in interpersonal situations;

(g) inadequate ability to 'take the role of the other' in interpersonal contact.

It appears that differences in 'social competence' between the various groups in the study may be traced to the following factors:

(a) parents' definition of 'the rules of the game' (which varies with social class);

(b) parent-child relationships, especially patterns of communication and extent of meaningful joint activities (which vary between as well as within social classes);

(c) extent of positive relationships with persons outside the nuclear family (which seems to vary with nature of community);

(d) participation in structured group activities outside the nuclear family (which seems to vary with class and community).

For the four subcultures in the study, 'social competence' does not correlate with socioeconomic status. Data suggest that it may be in the nature of a psychological variable standing in a dialectic but not deterministic relationship with social class.

The report concludes that in the context of educational policy the validity of the 'conflict of subcultures' hypothesis is very limited, and that it tends to obscure the basic issues involved. This would seem equally true in many other instances where a similar class-culture perspective is employed for the purpose of policy oriented research and the articulation of policy objectives. It is suggested that the concept of 'social competence,' as developed in this report, may be a more useful focus for the formulation of social policies designed to improve the condition of the socially, economically or educationally 'disadvantaged' in advanced industrial societies.

APPENDIX

Interviewing Guide

Do you like going to school? Why?

What things do you like (dislike) most about going to school? Why?

What subjects do you like (dislike) most? Why?

Have you ever attended any other school? (If yes) Did you like that school better? Why?

What kinds of teachers do you like (dislike) most? What kinds of things do these teachers do that makes you like (dislike) them?

If you like a teacher, does that make any difference in how well you do in a subject?

Does anybody help you with your homework? (If yes) How do they help you? (If not) Would you like to get help with your homework? (If yes) From whom? What would you like them to do?

Do your parents check whether you do your homework?

Do you sometimes play hookey from school? (If yes) What do your parents say to that? (Repeat question for teachers.)

Do your parents ever meet with your teachers? (If yes) Only when you get into trouble?

Do you think it is important to go to school? (If yes) What makes it important?

Do you think your parents feel the same way? (Repeat for teachers, siblings and friends.)

Have you ever thought about how far you would like to go in school (complete junior high, complete high, go to college, etc.)? Why?

Is this just what you would like to do or is it really what you think you are going to do?

Do your parents ever tell you that you are doing fine in school, or that you are doing poorly or not as well as you could if you really tried, and things like that? (If yes) What do they say? (Repeat for teachers, other school personnel, siblings, parents, friends.)

What do you think your teachers expect of you and of the other kids in class? What kinds of things do they say you ought to do (not to do)?

Do your parents ever nag you about things you ought to do (not to do)? What kinds of things?

Have you ever thought what you would like to do when you get out of school or what you would like to be? Why?

How do your parents feel about that? (Repeat for teachers.)

Can you describe your parents to me? What kind of people are they? What do you like and dislike about them? (Repeat for friends.)

What do you like or dislike about people generally, not the people we talked about. Just people in general.

Is there anybody you know or anybody you have read about, seen on TV or heard about in any other way whom you admire. The kind of person that makes you feel: I wish I were like that?

Do you spend much time with your father/mother/siblings? What kind of things do you do together? (Repeat for friends.)

Can you tell me something about your neighborhood? What kind of neighborhood is it?

Can you describe yourself to me? What kind of a person are you? If somebody asked: what kind of a fellow (girl) is ---- (name) what might the answer be?

I have asked you a lot of questions about the things and people you know. Now, in conclusion, I would like to ask you two 'make believe' questions:

> Suppose you were the principal of your school and you could change the school any way you wanted, make it into any kind of school you wanted, what would you do? What kind of things would you change?
>
> Suppose you had three wishes and you could wish for anything you wanted, for what would you wish?

REFERENCES

1. Willard Waller: The Sociology of Teaching. New York: John Wiley, 1932.

2. Frank Riessman: The Culturally Deprived Child. New York: Harper and Row, 1962.

3. Herbert Gans: The Urban Villagers. New York: Free Press, 1962.

4. Martin P. Deutsch: "The Disadvantaged Child and the Learning Process," in Riessman, Cohen and Pearl, edts: The Mental Health of the Poor. New York: Free Press, 1964 (p. 172).

5. Kenneth B. Clark: Dark Ghetto. New York: Harper and Row, 1965.

6. R. J. Havighurst and B. L. Neugarten: Sociology and Education. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 1958; and A. Harry Passow, ed. Education in Depressed Areas. New York: Columbia University Press, 1963.

7. Deutsch, op. cit., p. 173.

8. For a critical appraisal of some of the literature see Neal Gross: "Social Class Structure and American Education" Harvard Educational Review, Vol. 24 (1953), pp. 298-329.

9. Neal Gross: "The Sociology of Education," in Merton, Broom and Cottrell, edts.: Sociology Today. New York: Basic Books, 1959, pp. 144/145.

10. Published in The Urban Review, Vol. 2, No. 6. May 1968, pp. 2-8.

11. Ibid., p. 6.

12. Marshall B. Clinard: Slums and Community Development. New York: Free Press, 1966, Chapter 1.

13. Rosalie Cohen: "The Relation Between Socio-Conceptual Styles and Orientation to School Requirements," Sociology of Education, Spring 1968, pp. 201-220.

14. Ibid., p. 203.

15. L. Rainwater and W. L. Yancey, eds.: The Moynihan Report and the Politics of Controversy. Cambridge, Mass.: M.I.T. Press, 1967.

16. Martin L. Deutsch and Associates: *The Disadvantaged Child*. New York: Basic Books, 1967, p. 340.

17. Sheldon and Eleanor Glueck: *Unraveling Juvenile Delinquency*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1950.

18. Herbert J. Gans, "The Failure of Urban Renewal," *Commentary*, April 1965, pp. 29-37.

19. Ephraim H. Mizruchi: *Success and Opportunity*. New York: Free Press, 1964, p. 79.

20. A. H. Maslow: *Motivation and Personality*. New York: Harper, 1954.

21. Mizruchi, *op. cit.*, p. 81.

22. Hyman Rodman, "The Lower-Class Value Stretch," in Louis A. Ferman, et. al., edts: *Poverty in America*. Ann Arbour, Mich.: University of Michigan Press, 1965, pp. 270-285.

23. Gans: Urban Villagers, *op. cit.*

24. W. Brookover and D. Gottlieb, "Social Class and Education," in Gage and Charters, edts.: *The Social Psychology of Education*. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 1961.

25. Bernard Goldstein: *Low Income Youth in Urban Areas*. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1967.

26. Robert K. Merton, "Social Structure and Anomie," in *Social Theory and Social Structure*. Glencoe, Ill.: Free Press, 1959.

27. Unpublished manuscript by Harry Silverstone and Bernard Rosenberg. See also: Bernard and Nathan Lander, "Deprivation as a Cause of Delinquency: Economic or Moral," in Rosenberg, Gerver and Howton, edts: *Mass Society in Crisis*. New York: Macmillan, 1964, pp. 130-141.

28. J. A. C. Brown: *The Social Psychology of Industry*. Baltimore: Penguin Books, 1964, p. 206.

29. Theodore Caplow: *The Sociology of Work*. New York: McGraw Hill, 1954, p. 133.

30. Goldstein, *op. cit.*, p. 182.

31. John H. Flavell: *The Development of Role Taking and Communications Skills in Children*. New York: John Wiley, 1968.

32. T. S. Langer and S. T. Michael: *Life, Stress and Mental Health*. New York: Free Press, 1963, p. 448.

33. *Ibid*.

34. Deutsch and Associates, *op. cit*.

35. *Ibid*.

36. Eleanor Leacock, "Personality and Culture Theory in the Field of Education." Paper presented at the VIII International Congress of Anthropological and Ethnological Science, September 8-10, 1968, Tokyo, (mimeo) p. 8.

37. *Ibid*., p. 9.

38. *Ibid*., pp. 10-11.

39. *Ibid*., p. 9.

40. Urban Review, *op. cit*., p. 4.

41. James S. Coleman, *et. al*.: *Equality of Educational Opportunity*. Washington: U. S. Government Printing Office, 1966.

42. Leonard Reissman: *Class in American Society*. Glencoe, Ill.: Free Press, 1951, pp. 169-178.

43. P. Marris and M. Rein: *Dilemmas of Social Reform*. New York: Atherton Press, 1968, Chapter II.

44. Charles A. Valentine: *Culture and Poverty*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1968, Chapter I.

45. William H. Whyte: *The Organization Man*. New York: Simon and Schuster, 1956.

46. Allen Wheelis: *The Quest for Identity*. New York: W. W. Norton, 1958, Chapter 4.

47. Coleman, *et al*., *op. cit*.

48. Flavell, *op. cit*.

49. Seymour Rubenfeld: *Family of Outcasts*. New York: Free Press, 1965.